

Open Research Online

The Open University's repository of research publications and other research outputs

Sport and the state: ideology and practice

Thesis

How to cite:

Wiley, David Leonard (1989). Sport and the state: ideology and practice. PhD thesis The Open University.

For guidance on citations see [FAQs](#).

© 1988 The Author



<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

Version: Version of Record

Link(s) to article on publisher's website:

<http://dx.doi.org/doi:10.21954/ou.ro.0000dfb5>

Copyright and Moral Rights for the articles on this site are retained by the individual authors and/or other copyright owners. For more information on Open Research Online's data [policy](#) on reuse of materials please consult the policies page.

oro.open.ac.uk

D 77

UNRESTRICTED

David Leonard Willey, BA (Hons).

Sport and the State: Ideology and Practice

Submitted for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy at the

Open University.

31st October, 1988.

Author's number : M7019581

Date of submission : 31st October 1988

Date of award : 11th July 1989

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to acknowledge the help and assistance I have received during the process of my study.

I am particularly indebted to my supervisor, Geoff Esland, of the Open University for his ongoing encouragement and constructive criticism. I am grateful to H. Justin Evans, former Deputy Secretary and Acting General Secretary of the Central Council of Physical Recreation, for making available a number of primary documentary sources, to John Coghlan, former Deputy Director General of the Sports Council, for reading and commenting on draft material of one of the chapters, and to Jim Sadler, former Regional Director of the West Midlands Sports Council, for information and access to documents. I am also appreciative of the time, knowledge and insights provided by the many individuals whom I interviewed. In addition, I am thankful for the technical help given by Debbie in typing and printing-out the script.

However, whilst the study has benefited from the contribution of all these people, accountability for the interpretation and use of material and for the production of the thesis remains my responsibility.

CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
ABSTRACT	v
<u>CHAPTER ONE</u>	
<u>INTRODUCTION</u>	1
Aims, Scope and Method	1
The Sociology of Sport	8
Ideological Roots and Relationships: Humanism, Commercialism and Socialism	46
Key Concepts: Collective Consumption, Corporatism and Hegemony.	72
<u>CHAPTER TWO</u>	
<u>HISTORICAL CONTEXT: 1930-1960</u>	91
Unemployment, voluntarism and Physical Recreative Training	95
Youth, Citizenship and Commerce	115
Physical Education and Competition	130
<u>CHAPTER THREE</u>	
<u>POLITICAL DIMENSIONS OF SPORT: THE CENTRAL STATE AND ITS AGENTS</u>	142
Pressure For and Resistance to the Establishment of a Sports Council	148
The Structuring, Process and Effects of State Intervention	169
Government versus Sport	199
<u>CHAPTER FOUR</u>	
<u>LOCAL STATE, SPORT AND RECREATION</u>	217
The Corporate Movement, Planning and Management	220
Joint Provision/Dual Use, Education and Recreation: Sharing or Incorporation?	243
Central and Local Relations: Free Market Conservatism and Municipal Socialism	261
Community and Order: The Shift to the Right	273
<u>CHAPTER FIVE</u>	
<u>SPORT, BUSINESS AND THE STATE</u>	294
The Shift from Patronage to Corporate Interests and Requirements	304
Commercial Values and Liberal Positions	322

The Significance of Sponsorship in Local Settings	335
<u>CHAPTER SIX</u>	
<u>POLITICAL FUTURES</u>	359
The Radical Right and Sports Policy for the 1990s	359
Sport and Theoretical Perspectives on the Future	374
The Place of Sport in a Prospective Socialist Enterprise	390
<u>REFERENCES AND NOTES</u>	407
<u>APPENDIX</u>	470
Schedule of Interviews	470
<u>BIBLIOGRAPHY</u>	473
Books and Articles	473
Official Publications	480
Journals and Newspapers	483

ABSTRACT

The focus of the study is the growing involvement of the British state in sport from the early 1960s to the mid to late 1980s. The thesis maintains that the close association of the organisation of sport with education shifted under government and business influence towards an instrumental welfare role for the state, and towards a privatised entertainment oriented practice linked to business sponsorship and media influence.

Investigation is based largely on primary material derived from documentary and interview sources, and draws on a critical analysis of relevant contributions in the sociology of sport categorised here under pluralist, social reproduction, culturalist and state-investment perspectives. Particular use is made of the concepts of collective consumption, corporatism and hegemony.

The central theme is that sport has served a legitimacy purpose for the state. It is argued that state involvement in sport has a structural relationship with changing economic conditions, that political responses involved a complexity of factors, and that the ideological structuring and restructuring of the content and organisation of sporting practices has been framed by a tension between conservative and liberal forces. The Labour Party-led expansion of provision for sport has been shown to have been primarily a 'statist' stance underpinned by a corporate management ideology which, though increasing facilities, actually worked to reinforce inequalities. The Conservative Party though emphasising freedom and independence for organisations in sport has promoted central control and market values.

However, a number of disjunctions between intention and outcome have been pinpointed, and it has been evident that variations in purpose, structure and operation at local level have tended to modify the effects of centrally directed policies. Furthermore, it is held that initiatives on the political Left in the late 1980s offer potential for change in a cultural politics of the future focusing particularly on a reassessment of gender, nationalism and the control of time.

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Aims, Scope and Method

The announcement on 3rd February, 1965 by the Joint Under-Secretary of State for Education and Science, Mr. Denis Howell, of the decision of the Government to establish an Advisory Sports Council, marks the point at which the control of amateur sport and physical recreation in Britain shifted from its education guardianship to a body more responsive to the wider market of mainstream competitive sport (1).

Although until 1969 - when Denis Howell was transferred to Housing and Local Government, and promoted to Secretary of State (2) - the Government Department responsible for Sport and Recreation continued to be that of Education, the setting up of a Sports Council can be seen as a watershed in two ways. Firstly, in institutional terms, an apparatus was established which brought sport more closely under the influence of government ministers and departments; and secondly, in operational terms, in the development of policy with regard to sport the spheres of influence were widened beyond physical education and governing bodies to local authority and business interests.

With this announcement, not only was an institution formed; but also a process set in motion whereby sport became increasingly defined as an instrument of welfare for the state - serving as a social palliative for economic problems. It also provided an expanding market for the media, as well as business and commercial agencies - which the state aided and abetted, and in the 1980s exploited as a means of promoting efficiency, privatisation and

commodification in the promotion of radical Conservatism.

This study is concerned with examining the structures and hidden agendas in this process. It is about the transformation of an area of cultural activity - from 'sport as education' to 'sport as welfare and marketed entertainment' and will consider the key policy issues and debates and their outcomes at national and local levels. This will involve focusing on economic, political and ideological aspects of sport and state relations throughout the study, thus raising questions about the economic conditions, the nature of political initiatives, and the shift in - and conflict between - ideological positions which accompanied and influenced the changes in the organisation of sport. The economic, political, ideological order does not imply any relation of logical entailment such that the economic mode determines the others in any mechanistic way. Though the economic conditions have a fundamental influence it is maintained that sport and state connections are largely located in the political and ideological formations.

The term 'state' refers to the range of institutions which have statutory powers or discretionary authority given by central government in relation to sport. These include state departments - in particular, the Department of Education and the Department of Environment; state agencies, or quasi-statutory organisations - especially the Sports Council from 1972; and local authorities - which have assumed increasing significance in relation to the provision of recreation amenities since the mid-1970s. Theoretical interpretations of the 'state' will be examined in the Sociology of Sport section which follows.

To understand the transition will also necessitate considering

and tracing the role of the state in post-school sport and physical recreation from an earlier period - particularly the 1930s and the formation of the national co-ordinating voluntary body, the Central Council of Recreative Physical Training - through to the mid-1980s. The period 1930-60 was particularly significant for the establishment of relations between government and recreation bodies which served to give legitimacy support for the liberal capitalist state undergoing economic, military and social crisis. It was during this time too that recreation organisations constructed an officially-approved meaning for sports and physical activities in terms of liberal and conservative values. The sports administrators and politicians did not therefore start with a 'tabula rasa' in the 1960s when increased statutory support was being considered. A pattern of relationships, meanings and purposes for sport and physical recreation had already been constructed, and it is important to understand the political and ideological parameters of these in making sense of the changes which took place from 1960 to the mid-1980s.

The underlying problematics explored by the study are based on empirical evidence collected mainly from 1978 to 1984. They can be summarised and pinpointed in the following questions: How and why did the intentions of interested parties (physical educationalists and sports administrators, liberal reformers and politicians) who were concerned with obtaining state aid but maintaining independence actually lead to a system where the state secured greater control? How and why was this position of control used by the state to pursue wider political objectives in the amelioration of social problems, and with what effects? To what extent did the increase in state influence in policies for sport lead to an adjustment in the ideological standpoint of national and local sports organisations? How far did

the physical educationists who helped to create a national co-ordinating forum for sport (The Sports Council) act back on the physical education body from which they came? How did the subsequent development of interest in sport amongst the public and the identification by administrators of the need for further financial and administrative skills and expertise create a space which business interests filled, and which again shifted the ideological terrain, accentuating values which adhered to a more authoritarian and market dominated state apparatus?

In summary, this is a study of the political-economy of sport which involves examination of the central and local state, sports organisations, and commercial/business influences. The specific objectives are:

- (i) To analyse historically long term trends in sport in British society since the 1930s in relation to the state.
- (ii) To explore the economic, political and ideological significance of the state's intervention into the practice, organisation and resourcing of sport.
- (iii) To examine the role played by the growing sports business and commercial complex as it relates to the sport-state connections.
- (iv) To examine and assess the significance of contesting ideological groupings and interests relating to the definition and transition in sport.

In scope and method the study has drawn on personal background and experience, documentary sources, and interviews as the instruments for gathering empirical material. Particular focus has been provided by a number of case-studies including the Central Council of Physical

Recreation and the Sports Council, and these organisations have formed the basis of the case study at national level. At the regional and local levels, the study concentrates on the West Midlands. There were a number of reasons why this area was considered to be appropriate. Firstly it contains a range of local authorities across the political spectrum (3). Secondly, provision for sport and recreation has been most advanced in the metropolitan sector - and the West Midlands includes seven metropolitan boroughs. Thirdly, institutional and individual connections of national significance were apparent in the historical development of sports politics and administration - through Birmingham University, the Cadbury firm at Bournville, the Action-Sport experiments centred on the West Midlands Sports Council, and Community pilot schemes with West Midlands Football Clubs. Fourthly, the existence of seven metropolitan boroughs provides an opportunity for a wide-ranging enquiry into local authority provision and commercial sponsorship.

The author's personal background has also provided relevant experience of the events surrounding the topic of study. As a full-time Technical Officer of the Central Council of Physical Recreation/Regional Sports Council, London and South East (1968-1970), Physical Education Adviser for the London Borough of Waltham Forest (1970-1973), and British Association of Advisers and Lecturers' representative on the Central Council of Physical Recreation (1974-1977), I have had contact over a number of years with the organisations and institutions which are the subject for investigation. In addition, responsibilities in academic institutions of higher education since 1973 in the subject of sociology in relation to leisure, sport and recreation have enabled me to combine a practitioner's inside knowledge, contacts and experience in the administrative sporting world with a critical sociological perspective (4).

Examination and analysis of documents has formed an important part of the methodology of the project. The list covers key national reports (particularly the Wolfenden Committee Report 1960 on Sport and the Community), Government command papers, annual reports, journals, newspaper reports and articles, party manifestoes, Hansard records of parliamentary debates, minutes of national bodies (especially the Central Council of Physical Recreation, the Sports Council and the British Association of Advisers and Lecturers in Physical Education), and personal letters of sports officials. Much of this investigation has made use of primary sources. In particular, I have had access to a range of Government papers relating to physical recreation in the 1930s and 1940s; to the original minutes of the Wolfenden Committee covering the full period of its enquiry - 1957 to 1960; to minutes of the Central Council of Physical Recreation during the crucial period in 1971-1972 when its assets and staff were transferred to the executive Sports Council by Royal Charter; and to documents at the Working Class Movement Library, Manchester.

The study also drew on an extensive number of interviews of selected key individuals covering the following areas, bodies and institutions:

- (i) The Central Council of Physical Recreation.
- (ii) The Sports Council - Headquarters and West Midlands Region.
- (iii) Physical Education (H.M.I., Local Authority Advisers, College Lecturers, the British Association of Advisers and Lecturers in Physical Education, the Physical Education Association of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.
- (iv) Governing Bodies of Sport.
- (v) Local Authorities (including Chief Officers of Leisure Services Departments, Chairmen of Leisure Services Committees).

- (vi) Local Sports Councils.
- (vii) Business Firms (including Coca-Cola, Schweppes, Cadbury Schweppes, John Player, Bass/Mitchell and Butler, and Sava Centre).
- (viii) Recreation Management/Leisure Studies.
- (ix) Labour Movement (B. Rothman, former Secretary of the Manchester branch of British Workers Sports Federation and gaoled leader of the Mass Trespass, Kinder, 1932).

The number of interviews totalled 84, the majority of which were pre-arranged meetings of more than an hour covering a semi-structured set of questions. Some of these were tape recorded; all were transcribed and a written account produced following the interviews. In some cases more than one meeting was held. (See Appendix)

In examining key institutions like the Sports Council and local authorities several interviews were held with a range of personnel. In the case of the former, eight individual staff were formally interviewed and informal discussion held with three others. With the latter, twenty three interviews were conducted comprising officers and elected members across a range of Boroughs in the West Midlands, but also including the Greater London Council. Cross referencing and checking of interview accounts was thus made. In the case of the study of the West Midlands, the views of the local authority and Regional Sports Council were assessed alongside those of members of the West Midlands County Council, the Federation of Sport and Recreation Organisations, the local Sports Councils for the seven metropolitan boroughs, and personnel responsible for sponsorship developments in the West Midlands firms of Mitchell and Butler, Sava Centre and Tarmac. The structure of the questions varied slightly according to the particular groups interviewed, but they were standard in

focusing on change and transition, the major growth points, value positions, the diversity of the professional body, control, and above all underlying political pressures.

The Sociology of Sport

Interest in the state within the sociology of sport did not begin to emerge until the 1980s and is still developing in terms of knowledge and understanding of the state's involvement in sport. Part of the explanation for the belated academic attention is that until recently sociologists have tended to neglect the area of sport in general as a subject of study, and even with the expansion of sociology in Britain in the 1960s and 1970s the discipline as a whole eschewed any extended analysis of sport. Hargreaves (1982) indicates that this was the case even with notable developments in the sociology of leisure, the sociology of culture, community studies, the sociology of the family and the whole area of working class culture and consciousness. He suggests that the blindness of the academic community was not surprising in the sense that there was a deeply entrenched commonsense about sport throughout the culture. In particular, that sport for many people, including academics, is in some unique way symbolic of the social order and an important source of meaning which takes on for them the aura of the sacred. As a symbolic universe sport is seen by Hargreaves to be strongly resistant to an analysis that might reduce it to something other than its own terms, because this would be intrinsically subversive, not only of the universe of sport as thus conceived, but of the order of society it has come to represent. Consequently, as it is framed in the education system, constructed in the media and promoted by sports organisations sport is almost invariably assumed to be intrinsically valuable and the dominant conventional wisdom is left unchallenged (5). In addition, where a sociological study of sport has been pursued

this has been mainly dominated by a functionalist and positivist approach in relation to the social structure of western democratic societies (6). As Hargreaves also points out, a functionalist perspective tends to be implicitly oriented to conceptualising problems in a particular prescriptive manner, which follows from the notion that the existing structure of society is the 'normal' way modern societies function. Given the need to adapt to society's requirements, the whole sphere of leisure gets defined as a problem area in which sport can play a role in filling people's spare time, and this has been related to a social engineering approach both in policy-inspired research and in work which claims to be scientifically neutral (7).

This present study takes the line that the opening up of sport to a more critical examination than the traditional approach outlined above is needed. Such an enquiry should make connections with the structures of society, and make apparent the ideological processes and political interventions, both to emphasise the social context of sport and to provide an understanding of the association between sport and the exercise of power. The tacit understandings of sport implicit in the institutions and policies which have promoted its growth and development and contributed to the maintenance of the dominant forms of power relations need to be made evident if the significance of sport in society is to be more fully comprehended. From the late 1970s a few sociologists, mainly from outside of the sub-discipline of the sociology of sport, have recognised the importance of a more extended discussion of the area and of the role of the state in relations with sports organisations. For example, Roberts (1978), fearful of threats to the maintenance of pluralist and liberal values, took an anti-statist line on recreation provision, arguing that

coherent leisure policies could unwittingly turn leisure into an apparatus of social control (8). Hargreaves (1982), within the area of political sociology, drew attention to the increased intervention everywhere of the modern state and of its potential control and influence over sport (9). Gruneau (1982), writing on 'Sport and the Debate on the State', held that what was at issue was the degree to which the pursuit of sports organised in specific ways and possessing certain 'dominant' or 'oppositional' meanings aid in social reproduction - of particular relevance being the relationship of state action to these dominant or oppositional meanings and organisational modes (10); Whannel (1983), on 'State Policy and Social Reality' with reference to the politics of sport, highlighted the relationship between public and private provision and the widening of the gulf between rich and poor with the trend towards an impoverishment of the public sector and a boom in the expansive private sector (11). And Hall (1984), focusing on the revolution in the cultural face of Britain since the 1950s, emphasised that all popular occasions and events - thereby including sport - needed to be addressed by the Left to make socialism a popular political force. The idea of the providing state without equivalent movements of self activity in civil society was firmly rejected as undemocratic (12).

Thus from a range of political interpretations in academic study, the importance of a critically sociological understanding of sport and of the need to take into account the role of the state within this analysis has begun to be recognised. It is significant that this interest has developed alongside the incorporation of provision for sport into welfare state domestic policies, and its use as an element of foreign policy by a number of countries. The separation of sport from serious academic enquiry is gradually being challenged as it becomes evident that policies for cultural activities are closely linked with political issues. Nevertheless, there is

still a dearth of empirical investigation which places analysis within an economic, political and ideological framework. In order to assess more clearly the range of contributions which have been made, the kinds of issues addressed and the relevance of these for problematising the topic of sport and the state a more detailed discussion is required. This is presented here under four categories as a means of indicating the distinctive theoretical and policy perspectives. It is acknowledged that the individual writers mentioned may make use of concepts and ideas on a broader basis than the confines of a single perspective, and that the notions of social class or power may extend across perspectives. These categories should, therefore, not be regarded as a limiting framework, but rather as a way of making sense of the diversity of material which bears on the topic. At the same time the division of the contributions into the 'pluralist perspective', the 'social reproduction perspective', the 'culturalist perspective' and the 'state investment perspective' is made on the basis of contrasting characteristics. The first three bring out different theoretical approaches to the state, the fourth indicates a statist policy orientation. The pluralist position sees the state as a neutral instrument which functions positively to allow the system to operate more efficiently; the social reproduction stance is to demonstrate critically how the state serves to reproduce the system as a capitalist one. The culturalist view though also indicating how capitalist production is enabled to proceed, more flexibly emphasises the role of the state in relation to social, cultural, political and ideological levels. The notion of state investment is used to encapsulate a commitment to statist policies from differing political positions.

The pluralist perspective is clearly espoused in the work of Kenneth Roberts writing in the sociology of leisure, notably in his

books, Contemporary Society and the Growth of Leisure (1978), and Leisure (1981) (13). Sports policy is often subsumed under the umbrella of 'leisure' as a statutory service; it is therefore relevant to address the concept of leisure and the claims about its growth at the outset. Roberts provides a serious theoretical discussion of the phenomenon of leisure - and incidentally of the place of sport within recreation provision, and emphasises the significance of a sociological understanding which does not take comprehensive planning as a given but something to be explained. At the same time he makes a number of assertions both about the nature of leisure and of the nature of modern society which show an uncritical interpretation of western capitalist societies, and indeed regards leisure as an instrument to enrich what he describes as the socio-cultural pluralism that has taken root in those societies (14). However, as Clarke and Critcher point out, leisure as a social category is the product of historical development - it is the result of other processes which are not leisure, and this requires looking beneath the surface of leisure and examining the economic, political and ideological processes which have produced it (15). Roberts' notion of leisure is problematic in that it is content to examine the internal pattern of leisure without seeking to understand its relationship with other elements of the society, at least those which focus on power and the inequalities which derive from its exploitation.

A major reason for this inadequate conceptualisation of leisure is contained in the theoretical framework of pluralism he is concerned to defend. This emphasises individual choice and life style within a complex model of society on the basis of its function for the social system, and sets out to attack, in particular, interpretations of leisure which use social class as the key theoretical concept. He states:

In opposition to interpretations derived from conflict theory, functionalist sociologists have brought leisure within their own perspective. Whereas class analysts see leisure as reflecting and reinforcing broader patterns of conflict and domination, functionalists stress the contribution of leisure to the well being of society as a whole ... contemporary sport may display the imprint of the capitalist infrastructure. But so what? In a capitalist society enterprises are inevitably going to profit from leisure ... Linkages between sport and the wider social order are not in dispute. But what do they prove? Or are we merely confronting inter-relationships between leisure and other institutions that are inevitable in society? (16)

Roberts makes clear his acceptance of the inevitability and desirability of the capitalist system and its forms of leisure in further asserting:

The model of society that best enables us to understand contemporary leisure is a pluralist model - the unofficial ideology of Western society ... In recreation as in other spheres the public uses its leisure to nurture life styles and supply experiences which the individuals concerned seek and value ... This is the reality of modern leisure, and theories that fail to spotlight this aspect of reality prove their own need of revision. (17)

But as Clarke and Critcher point out, the intricate pattern of leisure preferences of the pluralist model involves an abdication of any attempt at explanation in a causal sense - apart, perhaps through the family, and leisure is by definition that part of life least affected by political and economic structures (18). Furthermore, as Fergusson and Mardle argue, the emphasis on the growth of leisure in the 1970s and 80s is problematic in that it serves ideologically to mask the increase in unemployment. Leisure may not necessarily anyway be increasing for those in work, but the unemployed are unemployed. Policy pronouncements which make connections between unemployment and leisure are an ideological attempt to disguise its true effects. Fergusson and Mardle also point out that in political terms too, state intervention in leisure provision is significant because it makes

leisure an act both of compulsory consumption and social control. Consumption of services like sports provision is compulsory in the sense that the use of facilities provided becomes institutionalised within a world of limited activity contexts (19).

A number of other points follow from Roberts' account of the growth of leisure which are of importance for consideration of policy relating to sport. These include the guidelines he sets out for state provision in a pluralist society, the case he makes for the promotion of the commercial and private sectors and his support for the values of liberal-humanism. With regard to state provision it is essential to note that the aim of Roberts' analysis is to defend the freedom of a socio-cultural pluralism not only against critics who deny that the phrase fits western societies, but also against those he refers to as usually unwitting enemies (such as the state and professional planners) who propose to meet the challenge of leisure in ways that could destroy its essential pluralistic character. He argues that the state has not been able to develop 'comprehensive' policies for leisure, since it is impracticable to provide for variable leisure needs and interests, and that it would be undesirable for it to do so, since this would limit scope for individual freedom of choice. He does, nevertheless, see a place for some state involvement. Indeed, the essential policy problem for Roberts is how to fashion a role for public bodies that will safeguard rather than threaten pluralism. He puts forward three criteria for a limited state provision:

- (i) When the supply of resources is finite beyond the short term - e.g. defending the public interest against commercial monopoly.
- (ii) When recreation is an expedient means to a non-recreational objective - e.g. national prestige or public health.
- (iii) When in the pursuit of distributive justice - for otherwise disadvantaged groups (20).

In principle, these criteria may appear reasonable. The safeguarding of public interest, the maintenance of health or the concern to provide resources for the disadvantaged are all in themselves desirable social objectives. The question is for what other ends are these being adopted. Using recreation for expedient means provides a justification for political intervention which may reduce the autonomy of recreation bodies, and the distribution of amenities to disadvantaged groups without an equivalent change in democratic control can actually serve to reinforce the inequality of those groups. Indeed, what needs to be stressed is the importance of looking behind the social objectives of policy statements to examine their ideological and political purposes. For Roberts the end is the maintenance of the existing capitalist social system, with all the divisions of class, gender and race that tend to be incorporated within it.

Roberts is also an advocate for the development of the commercial and private sector, maintaining that socio-cultural pluralism requires scope for commercial and voluntary effort. He contends that the best safeguard against dirigisme in the public sector is to prevent the balance of power swinging from the consumers' side of the market, and reasons that despite its imperfections the market remains one of the most effective participating mechanisms devised for modern societies. Leaving consumers with money in their pockets, he adds, is an excellent recipe for participation (21). Criticism of this view needs to be cautiously though firmly approached. While the market tends to deliver most to those who already have the advantages of wealth, power, status and influence, at the same time many ordinary people have become accustomed to either obtaining or wanting to acquire material goods. As Hall (1984) points out, from a socialist standpoint it is essential to come to terms with people's concrete and material aspirations rather than dismiss the

desire for the goods of modern technology. The important question he raises is in what political environment these aspirations are to be developed and realised. The challenge he poses for the Left is to expropriate material aspirations from identification with the private market and private appropriation (22). Although Roberts expresses a need for the state to intervene to offset the excesses of a market oriented system, it is evident that he favours the materialism of an open and consequently privatised society.

Underpinning Roberts' thinking for social action in what he sees to be a 'society of leisure' (sic) is his emphasis on the values of hedonism, humanism and liberalism - hedonism referring to the freedom for individuals to pursue pleasures without the constraints of many former necessary legal, customary, and moral inhibitions, humanism underlining the extension of awareness of people's capacities for enjoyment (intellectual, athletic and artistic), and liberalism accentuating individual choice as an intrinsic quality of leisure (23). The liberal-humanist approach is a re-emphasis, as Roberts indicates, of longer established values, a philosophy which is concerned to provide maximum freedom for individuals to follow their interests with a limited role from the state. But this also includes in Roberts' analysis the freedom of individuals to exploit market and commercial opportunities. His notion of liberal-humanism thus appears not to be in tension with commercialism but inter-dependent with it. Raymond Williams (1961) in The Long Revolution makes a distinction between liberal-humanists and industrialists in his analysis of the development of education in Britain in the 19th century. The former are seen to conceive of liberal education in relation to man's health as a spiritual being, and the latter to regard education in economic and vocational terms (24). Liberal-humanism and Commercialism indeed stem from distinctive and often opposing traditions, and it is to be argued later in the chapter that different attitudes can be identified

in sport in line with these traditions. It is relevant to note at this point, however, that the liberal emphasis on freedom can actually contribute to the extension of a market and commercial ethic and paradoxically limit the freedoms of a significant percentage of the population.

The combined effect of Roberts' ideas - whether intended or not - is not just to provide arguments for a leisure philosophy (which he separates off from life in general), but to legitimise the emerging radical conservative forces of the late 1970s and the 1980s, where stress has also been on choice, variety, individualism, voluntary and private enterprise, adherence to the market, and consumer sovereignty. But far from producing a social order based on tolerance - which Roberts predicted - there has been an erosion of individual freedoms as the state has increased its influence in more directive forms - in sport and recreation as well as education. The present study sets out to provide documentation and extended discussion of this tendency. Although Roberts is concerned to take issue with theories that focus on power, social control and social class in explaining the characteristics of western societies, it is evident in the policy developments, especially of the 1980s, that alongside the rhetoric of the free-society greater controls have been implemented over the mass of consumers dependent on public provision, while providing increased prospects for those consumers able to profit from an increased privatisation of resources. In this sense the account of society Roberts puts forward serves as an ideological support for an unequal and elitist system.

A contrasting approach to the pluralist perspective is provided by writers presented here under a social reproduction perspective which offers a critique of the nature of corporate capitalism in

relation to sport. Paul Hoch (1972) in the book, Rip Off the Big Game (25), and Jean-Marie Brohm (1978) in Sport: A Prison of Measured Time (26) are two of the main exponents of this perspective. Hoch focuses essentially on the United States of America whilst Brohm though writing in and about France makes more general reference to the international network of sport in western societies. Both of them draw on marxist critical theory, the former making reference to Marcuse, and claiming inspiration from Gramsci and the latter to Adorno, Habermas and Von Krockow.

Rip Off the Big Game is presented as a landmark in sports sociology in North America in that it makes a break with a tradition dominated by those like Loy and Kenyon who view the sub-discipline as a value free social science (27). Hoch focuses on the way that sport has been used historically to fit the ideological and socialisation needs of the power elite of American society, breaking the mould of studies which had the effect of upholding the status quo. The significance of Rip Off the Big Game lies in the critical examination it makes of the structures of society, particularly the institutions of business and the media, in which sport is produced. Its limitation is that it appears to fail to recognise the complexity of sporting practice. The differences between top level competitive sport and more casual recreative activity are not explored, and it does not seem to appreciate that sport could have a distinctiveness and autonomy which is not totally determined by the needs and values of an all-devouring sports industry.

Hoch regards sport as essentially a mirror reflection of the society in that it partakes of all the main contradictions of society, the most fundamental one being, 'the struggle between those who have power and those who don't, between capital and labour' (28). The

analysis Hoch develops using anecdote and many illustrations is based on a correspondence model, seeing sport in direct relation to the wider society. He states, for instance, that in football as in competitive capitalist society, the aim is to accumulate assets - in society called capital, in football points - by outmanouvering the opponent or forcing him (in football, yard by yard) off his territory (29). Sport, particularly American football, is characterised by its similarity to the hierarchy and structure of industry with a division of labour, specialisation and values of competitiveness and discipline which serve to socialise the players (workers) for capitalist production and for a composed working class. This connection between sport and industry draws attention to the way in which sport has become framed by the ethics of business. Since Hoch's publication in 1972 this has been intensified with business agents and media interests playing a greater role in the sponsorship and control of the organisation of sport - and the details and implications of this are addressed in Chapter Five. Hoch, in particular, draws on the comments of coaches, commentators and athletes to indicate the degree of pressure and alienation that had become prominent in the competitive world of varsity and professional sport, and where also a small elite played while the vast majority watched. He indicates that money and resources had been invested into sports for an elite because they were more marketable than intramural sports and states,

historically, the split between the field and the stands developed at the same time as the split between the factory managers controlling production and the workers performing their fragmented bureaucratised tasks on the assembly line (30).

While the links between developments in sport and changes in the capitalist system are important to make - for a proper understanding of

policies for sport lies in an analysis of their relationship with wider societal forces - there are problems with a perspective which views causality, domination and consciousness as framed solely within the logic of capitalist production. In this analysis the focus of domination appears to exist primarily within the economic realm, i.e. the world of industry. Politics seems to be subsumed within the reproductive functions of capitalist production, consequently reducing the possibilities of resistance that originates in the contradictions and struggles in the cultural/ideological sphere. Hoch argues that since sport is a mirror of society any reform of sport while leaving society untouched would change nothing at all, and that humane creative sports would only be achieved when a humane and creative society had been built. There are occasions when he indicates possibilities for change being initiated within sport as with his point that if players associations could get together to form a professional athletes union they would immensely strengthen their ability to win total players control, but in the main he likens organised team sport to:

the passive robot production of the assembly line, and increasingly of the proletarianised white collar jobs as well (31).

There appears to be little recognition in Hoch's position of the interplay of power, ideology and resistance. As Raymond Williams points out:

The reality of any hegemony in the extended political and cultural sense is that while by definition it is always dominant, it is never total or exclusive ... it does not just passively exist as a form of dominance. It has continually to be renewed, recreated, defended and modified. It is also continually resisted, limited, altered, and challenged by pressures not all its own (32).

Brohm like Hoch takes a reproduction model of analysis

indicating the role sport plays as a legitimating agent for the capitalist state, and in reproducing all the principles of bourgeois society in a concentrated form. His book represents an attempt to develop an analysis of international sport which locates it within a process of class collaboration and the capitalist mode of production. It comprises a series of articles or statements which were conceived as theoretical interventions in particular ideological contexts situated mainly in the period following the events of May and June 1968 in France, which were characterised by the disturbances involving students and workers in opposition against the Gaullist state. Two themes run through the book, Sport, A Prison of Measured Time. One concerns the symbiotic relationship between sport and work; the other focuses on the Olympic Games and its role in capital accumulation and in cementing a truce between opposing class interests, both at national and international level. The integrating mechanism for the organisation of sport in Brohm's analysis is the state which, he argues, locks in all the structures of society as a whole. The book provides insights into the role and function of sport in a capitalist society; but it is also full of assertions which are rarely substantiated or made concrete, and which fail to acknowledge the multiple forms of determination and disjunctions that characterise sport in different contexts.

In relating sport to work Brohm adopts a correspondence theory of reproduction in noting the similarity between production line work and the process of training for sport - governed by the principle of maximising output and productivity (referring to 'work rate' and 'pain barrier' in training). He shows how sport has borrowed from Taylorism and other theorists of scientific management to extract the last ounce of effort and productivity from competitors. This is linked to the obsession of champions, and is thought by Brohm to be inevitable also

under socialism unless sport can be rid of its single minded competitiveness. He rejects the view that there is a distinction between top-level sport and mass sport, since he holds that both are based on the principle of maximum output. Educative sport to him is a myth. However, this seems to be unsatisfactory in that it fails to appreciate that the context and conditions of competitive activities can make a great difference. The casual game of table tennis or five-a-side football are surely different from highly professionalised and commercialised spectator events; and whilst table tennis or football may be part of statutory provision for other instrumental social purposes, they could also form a programme of activities within a democratically controlled organisation.

Brohm devotes four chapters to the Olympic movement attempting to reveal what lies behind the overt concern with humanitarian values, moral order and the amateur ethic. He concludes that the Olympic Games are deeply entwined with business and that when countries bid for the games they do so for hard commercial reasons. He argues that finance capital has made its way into the sports apparatus through advertising, organisational assistance and very often as a financial backer. He further points out that while the national and international sports system is rapidly being colonised by state monopoly capitalism, the capitalist groups have in their turn developed a veritable sports industry, based not only on the production of articles and commodities linked to the practice of sport, but also the provision of services. This is explained in terms of the capitalist system obeying the laws of the expansion of capital. Brohm states:

The constant equalisation of the rate of profit explains the dizzy slide of capital from one sector of economic activity to

another and the opening up of new areas for the accumulation of capital ... To meet the difficulties caused by over-capitalisation and over-production in traditional industrial sectors, capital is invested in 'marginal' sectors such as services, tourism and sport. This explains the sudden expansion of the sports industry during the 1960s ... capital has penetrated the organisation and running of competitive sport from top to bottom ... contrary to the naive reformist view, it is impossible to separate sporting activity proper - pure sport as it were (the coming together of athletes from different countries sharing the same Olympic ideal: 'citius, altius, fortius') - from its capitalist, or at the international level, imperialist material base (33).

It is difficult to deny that the Olympics have become a vast commercial enterprise, that business has since the 1960s increased its involvement in sport, or that countries wish to host the games for commercial ends. The intense competition between nations for the 1992 Olympic Games provides evidence of the material attractions of sport (34). However, sport is not only about capitalist profit, even though the economic dimensions described by Brohm provide a powerful analysis of the way sport is increasingly linked to the mechanisms of the capitalist system. The problem with an economic interpretation, which the correspondence model of Brohm utilises, is that it is unable to account for the relative autonomy of institutions in sport or to see the possibilities for examining how the contradictions and tensions generated within such semi-autonomous realms can be used to promote sporting and social change.

The significance of the state is underlined by Brohm in his contention that the form of bourgeois society is summed up in its state which acts repressively to control the activities particularly of young people. Referring specifically to France in the post 1968 period he indicates that the bourgeois offensive against youth is co-ordinated by the state on the basis of one overall approach which

seeks to decide the fate of young people confronted with problems of selection, choice of career, police repression, mass unemployment and cultural downgrading, and that state policy with regard to sport makes sense in this context. He also extends this notion of the strong state to all capitalist industrial nations in which the idea of sport as leisure is condemned on the grounds that it is a factor for reducing the population to a mass and for exercising discipline. He asserts that:

Repression through sport has become a matter for the state... The state has had to bring sport into schools, not just because elite, prestige sport needs to recruit from the mass base of school and college sport, but also and most importantly, because sport is the best way of keeping control over young people (35).

Inherent in this dimension of the correspondence theory is a monolithic view of domination and an unduly passive view of human beings. Sport is seen by Brohm as totally oppressive, and as a morality of effort which conditions people for the oppressive work of the factory. While it is apparent that sport may serve as an agency of domination, a more sophisticated and sensitive treatment of the connections between power, ideology and resistance is required for an adequate analysis of sport in relation to the state.

However the reproduction paradigm as developed by Hoch and Brohm provides some important insights for a more critical and penetrative understanding of sport than the contribution of pluralism. Firstly, it focuses on societal power and the structures which maintain the existing system, thus emphasizing the value of analysing the role of government, the state apparatus and business. Secondly, it gives an

indication of the ways in which natural interests of play and recreation become subverted, and in this respect underlines the role of ideology in maintaining dominant interests. Thirdly, by attacking the idea that sport can educate for change, because it is structured by competition, it encourages a critical examination of the values attached to sport, recreation and physical education.

At the same time the stance taken by Hoch and Brohm is assertive and crude, and does not give sufficient recognition of the potential for participants to act back on the structures produced. It is deterministic and politically pessimistic, and it can be questioned whether sport reproduces inequalities in a direct and simplistic way. Sport may not be just a mirror reflection of society, but rather a significant area of culture which has its own contradictions and tensions, and in which values are formed which in turn can contribute significantly to wider changes.

It is this scope for change and the dialectical interplay of power, ideology, and resistance that is addressed in the culturalist perspective. In relation to sport the most significant contributions are those of Hart Cantelon and Richard Gruneau (1982) (36), and John Hargreaves (1982) (1984) (1985) (1986) (37); other critiques, though not focused only on sport, have been those of Stuart Hall (1984) (1986) (38) and John Clarke and Charles Critcher (1985) (39). The work of Gramsci and to some extent Althusser underpins the theoretical tradition in these studies. In all these publications the importance of an understanding of the state is underlined for any analysis of power in culture and sport; it is therefore crucial for my study to assess the scope and limitation of work in this perspective.

Cantelon and Gruneau helped to focus on the state and its role in ideology and cultural production in bringing together conference contributions under the title, 'Sport, Culture and the Modern State' and the preface to this document emphasises the purpose as being to redress the theoretical imbalances of a politics of sport which has been limited to pluralistic and reproduction models. The key point of criticism by Cantelon and Gruneau of most of the writing of people interested in sport and politics is that the political role that different sporting practices themselves play in social and cultural life has been overlooked. What is left out are the issues of power and domination. Cantelon and Gruneau thus advance theoretical discussion on sport and the state, though do not provide empirical analysis at this stage.

In Britain, almost the only attempt to focus on these issues in any developed and systematic way has been limited to the writings of John Hargreaves - with a series of articles in the late 1970s and 1980s leading to a book, Sport, Power and Culture (1986). The book is a social and historical analysis of popular sports in Britain. Hargreaves' central thesis is that sport was significantly implicated in the process whereby the growing economic and political power of the bourgeoisie in 19th century Britain was eventually transformed into that class's hegemony or ideological dominance in the later part of the century. He takes the turning point of change in four periods: around the turn of the 19th century; the mid-19th century; the mid-1880s and the 1950s. The need for a longitudinal historical view is thus stressed and as Stuart Hall notes in the 'Foreword', this historical framework provides a context for posing serious theoretical issues: in particular, to the way sport has been articulated to the relations between classes; the part played by sport in the re-education and re-formation of the popular classes and to the

'state' which sport represents in the general relationships of power in society. In analysing the period of the 1960s to 1980s Hargreaves focuses on state intervention and the commercial penetration of sport, as well as assessing the changing discourse in physical education from the post World-War II. As Hall also points out, his treatment of these themes is enhanced by his awareness of how they intersect with questions of gender, ethnicity and individualism.

Hargreaves' study is both broad and deep. His historical analysis is combined with a penetrative critique of sport which through the concept of hegemony traces how political domination has been assisted by state policies both in maintaining social democracy in the 1960s and 1970s and the shift to authoritarian populism in the 1980s, and in this respect draws on Hall's own work. At the same time his view of hegemony is neither mechanistic nor deterministic. Indeed he makes clear his recognition of the paradox that sport has liberating tendencies as well as manipulative manifestations. The autonomous nature of sport and its potential value in people's lives is emphasised and contrasted with the conflicts which have resulted with state intervention and commercial involvement. This dialectic is evident in his recognition of sport as a force both for the achievement of bourgeois hegemony and as a challenge to it. Following Hall, and the inspiration of Gramsci he emphasises the contradictory character of popular culture: that it possesses a critical, dissatisfied, discontented and disruptive side, as well as more conservative, compliant, conformist aspects, and identifies ways in which sport as a cultural form is being more systematically transformed into a contested terrain - thus rendering it problematic as a theatre of accommodation between dominant and subordinate groups. Three forces are cited:

- (i) Government handling of the problem of the alienated population of the inner cities.
- (ii) The tension between attempts to rationalise and programme sport in the national interest and its characteristic as an autonomous means of expression.
- (iii) The pressure to transform sport from a male dominated domain into one in which women have an equal opportunity to express themselves and satisfy their needs.(40).

With regard to the inner cities, state intervention under the new authoritarian conservatism is considered to polarise rather than accommodate dominant and subordinate groups, whilst conflict between central and local government over provision of social services is thought to shift the conflict to the level of the state apparatus rather than solve problems. In relation to the conflict between state-led programming and freedom in sport, Hargreaves argues that the autonomy of sport places limits on its use value, beyond which any legitimising, accommodating function it may possess would tend to be jeopardised and conflict generated instead. Audiences may become alienated by too high an expectation generated by the commercialised transformation of sport as an entertainment spectacle, and ruthless sporting competition, whether commercially or politically motivated may have unforeseen counter-productive effects. It is held by Hargreaves that the more the desire to play is frustrated and reduced, the less it works as entertainment, and the less efficacious sport is for control purposes. On the issue of the transformation of male domination Hargreaves acknowledges that the project has hardly begun, but that it is on the agenda, and that given the centrality of sports to male identity formation if the pressure continues it is likely to transform sport into a fiercely contested terrain.

Hargreaves' work is an important contribution to understanding sport and power and provides many insights into how a study of the state has become crucial both for a knowledge of the political and ideological dimensions of sport and of the significance of this both in analysing and working for cultural change in society. Hargreaves makes a point of some substance in underlining the contradiction of state intervention threatening to undermine the legitimising function that sport performs. The question is, however, whether the powerful forces of the capitalist system will adapt to and absorb any kind of challenge made to it, or whether any real gains can be made by subordinate groups. Hargreaves recognises the contingent nature of hegemony and that it can never be guaranteed, but erosion by the Left of the hegemonic project under the Thatcherist influence in the 1980s appears not to have been very successful. The possibilities for change are cited, but the reality is that the forces of the Left do not seem sufficiently to recognise this potential. This study pursues Hargreaves' focus on state intervention and the commercialisation process in particular, and attempts to provide further empirical material to analyse a number of the issues he raises, but making specific the theme of transition from sport as education to sport as welfare and entertainment and giving attention to the policy questions in physical education and sport. In this context a key theme is the limited capacity for change in the 'top down' statist approach of Labourism both in the 1960s and 70s and in the 1980s.

Stuart Hall's interest in cultural politics and recognition of the significance of popular movements in ideological work has identified and interpreted the meaning of sporting activities associated with running, and the broader interests in health. Hall sees this trend as indicative of a contemporary consciousness of the mid-1980s - a spontaneous popular movement of civil society ahead of,

rather than sponsored by the authorities; a concern with participation rather than spectatorship; and, in the Sport Aid campaign led by pop-star Bob Geldof, a challenge to the self-help ideology of Thatcherism through its altruistic thrust.

Hall's contribution to an understanding of sport and the state is to emphasise the political nature of culture, of which sport is significant as a popular interest. It provides both an analysis of the strength of ideas in bringing about change, and a critique of the traditional left for not engaging in a cultural politics as a strategy for transition to socialism. Hall's interest is not in sport as such, but in extending analysis to all areas of popular culture to emphasise the role of civil society rather than the state in bringing about cultural change - in particular towards a broad based anti-Thatcherite popular politics. The reference to sport is only part of Hall's more major ideological account of Thatcherism and the way to resist and counter its tendencies (41). It is not, therefore, just his inclusion of sporting activities in the list of popular interests that makes his work important for an understanding of sport and the state. His ongoing analysis of the Thatcherism phenomenon in the late 1970s and 1980s offers a rich source of ideas for insights into the way in which the state and its agencies - including institutions like the Sports Council and local authorities - have been brought in to the strategies of the Thatcherist project. This project has not only pursued the privatisation of the public sector, but installed 'enterprise' and 'value for money' as the commonsense language of Labour-led councils as well as quasi-governmental organisations.

It is true that, for example, Jessop et al. have taken issue with his analysis of Thatcherism, but the ensuing debate has served to clarify and extend understanding of the phenomenon of Thatcherism and

approaches towards it (42). In particular, Jessop et al. hold that Hall's meaning of 'authoritarian populism' as a description of the Thatcherist project is imprecise and its use overextended; that he shows an excessive concern with the mass media and ideological production at the expense of political and economic organisation and that the authoritarian populism approach tends to homogenise the impact and universalise the appeal of Thatcherism. Hall in response makes clear that the notion of authoritarian populism was conceived as a deliberate contradictory term to encapsulate the contradictory features of the emerging conjuncture in the latter half of the 1970s: a movement towards a dominative and authoritarian form of democratic class politics - paradoxically rooted in the 'transformism' of popular discontents. Hall indicates that the concept of authoritarian populism is only a partial explanation of Thatcherism which essentially refers to changes in the balance of forces, and that it references but could not explain changes in the more structural aspects of capitalist formations. He also points out that while he himself has concentrated on the political/ideological level in his analysis of Thatcherism, it is impossible to conceptualise or achieve hegemony without the decisive nucleus of economic activity. At the same time he emphasises that Thatcherite politics aim to struggle on several fronts at once, not on the economic corporate one alone.

John Clarke and Chas Critcher's book The Devil Makes Work - Leisure in Capitalist Britain, is within the tradition of cultural studies, the authors making clear that their interest is not really in 'leisure' itself, but in what an analysis of it can reveal about the development, structure and organisation of the whole society. Sport as an aspect of the study is looked at in the same way. Like Hargreaves' publication it takes an historical and critical approach. In addition to a radical re-appraisal of the key theoretical inputs in

leisure studies it argues that the dominant features of contemporary leisure - its domination by the market and the state, persistent inequalities and the drift towards post-industrialism - demonstrate how leisure has become an integral part of the structure of capitalist society. Two aspects of Clarke and Critcher's book are especially relevant to note in examining policies for sport: firstly, their focus on the contradictions and ambiguous status of leisure in British society, particularly, the distinction they make between freedom and compulsion in experiencing leisure; and secondly, their analysis of how capitalism has incorporated leisure as a form of economic and cultural domination.

The interest of Clarke and Critcher in leisure in British society is part of a wider purpose of drawing attention to the political significance of how time is structured and inequitably distributed. The importance of understanding this is stressed for future socialist strategies which, they argue, should advocate the socialised control of time as well as the historical concern with socialised control of the state and the economy. The essential issue is to reveal how work and leisure have been separated with leisure performing the purpose of making work more tolerable. They emphasise that unless the problem of work and leisure is clearly and radically defined we shall remain locked into managing the contradictions of an alien system. The contradictions and ambiguities about leisure are spelled out in the contrast between, on the one hand, references to it as 'emancipation, a society peopled by freely choosing and creative individuals' and, on the other hand, as 'the dark entanglement of idleness and vice'. Thus leisure invokes a fear by dominant groups of freedom and its illicit pleasure. The expansion of leisure provision and organisation by the state with sports centres, leisure centres and community centres is seen by Clarke and Critcher to have flourished

not only to improve the quality of leisure but also to foster social integration. In this context a developing leisure profession is considered to be showing signs of translating the social process that it deals with into professional definitions. The tension they identify between control and choice models of leisure is interpreted in an opposing way to the liberal pluralist's advocacy of choice as reflecting a desirable reality. As Clarke and Critcher state:

Choice has become the ideological validation of a system which in practice denies people the power to exercise control. We have come to live the definition of leisure as 'time free to choose'. The choices we can and do make disguise those we can't and don't. These limited choices allow us to feel that we shape our own lives. Rarely do we consider either the narrow range of things represented by that pattern or the interests served by their production and consumption. Economic and political constraints on leisure choice remain hidden, cultural and social constraints are internalised as the natural order of things, social divisions are turned into a pluralism of differences in taste and interest. (43)

While this is an important challenge to the prevailing uncritical emphasis on individual choice in the sociology of leisure and amongst leisure practitioners, at the same time, there does seem to be a view of people - the working class in particular - as rather effectively integrated into the system. Even though there is a recognition that leisure is always potentially an arena for cultural contestation between dominant and subordinate groups, they see little evidence of substantial resistance to capitalist domination through leisure, certainly within the socialist movement.

Having said this, Clarke and Critcher provide a powerful analysis to demonstrate that leisure and sport is now central to capitalist economic and cultural domination. They argue that the search for integration through leisure, although particularly sharply

revealed in policies directed at the unemployed and inner-city populations, is in fact the key to understanding the organisation of state policy and leisure. A useful framework is provided for explaining change in policy for sport in the shift from 'assimilation' to 'multi-culturalism'. The former is characterised in the post-war policy of bringing sport to the masses to be turned into responsible citizens, and the latter as a more recent recognition by the state of the existence of different cultures and the diversity of leisure needs. However, multi-culturalism which is evident in the targeting of minority groups by the Sports Council (1982) is held by Clarke and Critcher to be paternalistic and essentially a concern about maintaining social integration and harmony in the face of an unequal and conflictual society. It would be fruitful to explore this notion in more detail and to extend such an analysis to a local context. In addition to focusing on the role of the state in recreation Clarke and Critcher emphasise the significance of its increased commercialisation indicating that leisure has become one of the key sectors of the economy and that expansion of the leisure market has enabled corporate diversification, monopolisation and vertical integration. The connection between business and sport is traced through the increasing scale of sponsorship and the incorporation of sport as an adjunct of the advertising industry. A significant observation in this analysis is that the illusion of sport as independent from the rest of social life may be undermined highlighting the way in which leisure, and sport in particular, is being 'subjected more visibly to the power and control of the economic organisations which shape the reality of our working lives' (44).

Clarke and Critcher in their analysis thus hold onto the economic base but also the super-structure of the political and ideological level. Their analysis of state power and policy in

relation to leisure seeks to reveal the inadequacies not only of a liberal pluralist approach, but also of a vulgar Marxist position. Like Roberts they agree that the state is not simply a tool of capitalist interests - in the instrumentalist version of Miliband - but in opposition to Roberts they argue that we also need to be aware that concessions and compromises have taken place within the 'taken for granted' structure of a capitalist society. The value of Clarke and Critcher's approach in The Devil Makes Work - Leisure in Capitalist Britain is in identifying and examining aspects of a taken for granted social structure, and this is a necessary condition for a critical understanding of sport and the state.

Contributions included in a fourth perspective - that of state investment - start from a more pragmatic position in which the main consideration is the nature of a reformed or radical statist approach to sports provision. The texts to be considered vary both in their professional context and political frame of reference. Physical educationists like Don Anthony and Peter McIntosh speak as academics and administrators of sport with a commitment to educational and humanistic dimensions. Their concern is to argue for change in the values and administrative structure and organisation of sport, but since this operates within an assumed framework about the nature of British society it conveys an implicit liberal position. Also included is a more sociological input, specifically from Garry Whannel who advocates a radical approach in presenting 'arguments for socialism' in relation to provision for sport. In addition there are those such as Peter Bramham and Ian Henry, and Fred Coalter, Jonathan Long and Brian Duffield who write within Leisure Studies but with a view to influencing leisure policy. In so doing they raise a range of searching political issues applicable to national and local state contexts. There is some link in this range of inquiry with the

theoretical frameworks presented under the pluralist, social reproduction and culturalist perspectives, but what distinguishes the studies now to be considered from earlier perspectives is the more specific focus on a future state programme for recreation and sport.

The sports educationist stance is seen in Don Anthony's A Strategy for British Sport (1980) (45) and Peter McIntosh and Valerie Charlton's The Impact of Sport for All Policy 1966-1984 - And a Way Forward (1985) (46). Anthony places the rationale for his book in the context of his own emotional commitment to the practice, teaching and study of sport. It sets out to describe how sport is organised, but also to convey his views about how sport should be developed. He maintains that physical educationists should maintain leadership of the sports movement (activities and the organisation of these from the recreative to the highly competitive) and is totally opposed to the growing tendency to surrender this leadership to commerce and market forces. In describing and commenting on the organisation of sport and how it could be improved Anthony states:

Wherever one looks in the world,
there is a similar problem - how
can a country relate its sports
administrative systems to
the governmental system in general
and how can the state sector and
the private sector, in sport
administration, relate to each other (47).

In seeking how to resolve this Anthony certainly takes a stand on a number of issues, maintaining the 'health' and 'educational' value of sport against the domination of market forces and hypocrisy of sports apartheid. His ideal strategy advocates fully democratising sport, bringing about international communication and solidarity, and the development of an ideology to promote sport in industry and society at large through unity of the range of institutions - schools,

colleges, the media and governing bodies and government. But whilst he is critical of the barriers to the achievement of these objectives, he fails to locate them within the structure of society itself or the wider political and ideological forces that prevail. It is a personal statement about social issues surrounding sport, but does not provide or utilise tools of analysis with which to evaluate them. The result is an identification of trends and concerns, with a partial and idealistic assessment of the problems. He assumes that state aid is necessary and accepts ultimately piecemeal and pragmatic changes to the existing administrative system.

Peter McIntosh and Valerie Charlton's assessment and report of Sport for All Policy in Britain provides an informed review of the policies of the Sports Council and its role in developing a Sport for All movement. It gives detailed references of reports and policy documents and traces the changing government approaches to sports provision. In doing this it uses the concepts of 'wants' and 'needs' and distinguishes between the justification of policy in the 1960s as against the 1970s - a change from enabling people to do what they wanted, towards providing people with what they needed. They explain the differences between 'wants' and 'needs' with the former being based on individual choice and the latter by collective decree - which includes politicians at local or national level. The reasons for policy makers adopting the needs approach are justified by virtue of its advantages of universality, objectivity and viability. At the same time two dangers are pointed out: firstly, the potential conflict between the needs of the Government and sportsmen and sportswomen; and secondly, the possibility of policy makers seeing everyone's needs in terms of their own. The body of their report suggests a number of measures which is thought might be taken to enable Sport for All to fulfil more successfully the social functions

which have been set for it (reducing coronary heart disease, vandalism, urban boredom and frustration). Underlying all these measures is the principle of matching wants with needs. They conclude that Sport for All has not been achieved, and that it has been used too instrumentally by policy makers for social ends rather than as an end in itself. They suggest that Sport for All might be more obtainable through moving towards sport as enjoyment rather than social function.

However, although McIntosh and Charlton provide a useful systematic narrative and review of Sport for All they do not concern themselves with the political process or how their suggestions for development might be achieved; neither do they critically penetrate the well documented overview of policy. There is a tendency to let the rhetoric of government statements stand as reality instead of placing these within the economic, political and ideological purposes of governments. They adopt instead an implicit liberal position of sport needing no justification beyond itself. Nevertheless, the issue and debate of whether sport should serve social purposes is fundamental to the examination of the role of the state and McIntosh's own part in the process of shaping approaches to state provision will be developed further in the course of this study. In sum, the sports educationist position as represented by Anthony, and McIntosh and Charlton is confined to a liberal critique of the administration of sport, and government policy towards that.

A socialist approach to how sport can be made more progressive provides a second category which can be placed under a statist perspective though with criticism of the state's existing role - and is explicitly presented by Garry Whannel as part of the series Arguments for Socialism in *Blowing the Whistle - the Politics of*

Sport (1983) (48). The role of the state for Whannel is not, indeed, one rooted in a social democratic tradition; rather the transformation of public provision based on social ownership and democratic control. He argues that a socialist policy for sport should contain four elements: an egalitarian intention with positive discrimination to counter existing structures and attitudes; adequate facilities and funding to make Sport for All possible; social ownership of facilities, recreation land and the subsidiary leisure industry; and democratic control of sports facilities by those who work in and use them.

Whannel is critical of the Sports Council's strategy - formulated in the early 1980s - which, though making a case for increased funding fails, he says, to highlight the crisis in public provision, does nothing to pinpoint the causes, and is of no help in fighting cutbacks. He states,

At a time when the gulf between rich and poor is widening, the Sports Council not only has no effective strategy but fails to recognise that there is a problem (49).

Whannel indeed raises a number of important points, stressing throughout that the organisation, finance and dominant values of sport are rooted in politics and that there is a need to make socialist ideas popular. However, the book also has some limitations as an analysis of sport and the state. It is extremely brief and superficial on some aspects, merely summarising secondary sources on, for example, the development of the state's role and the growth of the Central Council of Physical Recreation and Sports Council. Some of the points of criticism remain unsubstantiated and no footnotes are provided; though as a book which is part of a series to raise issues

and provide arguments for socialism for public consumption, rather than for an academic audience, this omission may be expected. In this context it does provide insights of some of the approaches and limitations of policies in sport up to the early 1980s, and indicates what a socialist approach might involve.

However, there is insufficient appreciation of the internal dynamics of policy and practice, and the power of liberal democracy to absorb and incorporate radical strategies. Some of the outward effects of policy are indicated - privatisation, tobacco sponsorship, restrictions on expanded provision - but the interplay of forces behind these are only partially developed. Yet, an awareness is shown of the reasons why the socialist tradition has generally given physical matters a low status, and the need to link sport with cultural politics is clearly advocated in line with the culturalist perspective.

Debate on the function, role and efficacy of public services stimulated both by the resurgence of laissez-faire neo-Liberalism within the Conservative Party, and those on the Left who have begun to examine critically the role and operation of many social welfare institutions, is specifically and critically addressed in recent work emerging in Leisure Studies, notably by Bramham and Henry (1984) (1985) (1986) (50) and Coalter, Long and Duffield (1986) (51), and can be seen as a departure from the traditional Leisure Studies sociology represented by Roberts and Parker (52), and the cultural studies critiques. Bramham and Henry have attempted to look for ways of clarifying the domains of sports sociology drawing on Anthony Giddens' reconceptualisation of sociological theory into social theory; particularly his 'theory of structuration', which attempts to synthesise the perspectives of interactionists (communication),

functionalists (morality) and Marxists (power) and, as Dallmayr points out, aims chiefly to link an adequate account of meaningful action with the analysis of its unanticipated conditions and unintended consequences (53). Bramham and Henry suggest ways of developing empirical work on 'political ideology', and 'the role of the local state', in two separate articles. In the first of these a deductive approach is used to construct an ideal typology for a political ideology of leisure based on statements of key liberal, conservative and socialist thinkers. They appear to be aware of the limitations of such an approach - that the adaptation of Weber's methodology can only be the beginning of an analysis, and that the task of social theory is to go beyond the values behind political ideologies and explain how ideas function in particular historical situations. However, this is not fully achieved in the paper. There is little on the role of professional groups in the construction of ideologies. The relationship between the ideological forces is not developed, and the neutralisation strategies of the state are not explicitly pursued. They conclude that leisure - including sport - is best characterised as falling within a social democratic tradition of policy outcomes which reflect pragmatic and ideological compromises. The argument for this is that increased allocation to urban aid funding will mean increased public sector expenditure on certain kinds of leisure services provision at the local level. However, although this interpretation may have applied the principle of Giddens' unanticipated conditions, it appears to have failed to take account of other shifts in policies which were having a negative effect on the operation of local authority recreation and sports provision. The extent to which ideological and practical continuities and discontinuities have been effected at the local level is clearly an issue to be pursued in my study and one requiring further empirical evidence.

Bramham and Henry begin to focus on this need in their article, 'Leisure, the Local State and Social Order' (1986). They are concerned here to explain how particular state responses are mediated by professionals in the initiation and implementation of policy. The article provides an overview of competing models used in analysis of the state and competing explanations of and provision for leisure, and examines policy responses from professionals working in the inner city, exploring the similarities in and problems of 'community policing' and 'community recreation'.

The comparative examination based on mainly secondary documentary sources is interesting for its identification of tensions in both professional groups - between progressive and traditional approaches which reflect differences in shared values between enlightened, usually upper tier policy orientated professionals, and work force implementors who deal face to face with clients. It is such studies which need to be advanced. In this case more work would be needed to develop greater historical and in-depth empirical support.

With regard to the theoretical models, Bramham and Henry, although tending to equate marxist accounts with structural versions, which are rejected for the distancing of theory from empirical investigation, nevertheless, do recognise the potential of the culturalist approach if historically and empirically grounded (although this is strangely not identified as Marxist). In this sense they see a link between Gramsci and Giddens in the process of structuration. To summarise, Bramham and Henry are clearly attempting to contribute to theoretically informed analysis of leisure policy and much of their work is pedagogic in explaining the various models on offer; it is also promotional in arguing for a particular kind of synthesising of

theory. But although they are identifying relevant areas for attention, they themselves have only provided a limited amount of empirical material to date.

The study by Coalter, Long and Duffield 'Rationale for Public Sector Investment in Leisure', advances further the new analytical, empirical and critical approach in Leisure Studies, making some reference to sport as part of a wider perspective, which includes the Arts and Countryside. The aim is to understand the interests, values and attitudes informing leisure policies, rather than provide a detailed blue print for policy initiatives or administrative reform. At the same time it is an attempt to raise questions of direct relevance to those attempting to formulate coherent policies, to address the implications of the development of professionalism and to place leisure on the political agenda. Their expressed hope is that they can stimulate a much needed debate on the rationale for a future social policy for leisure - and implicitly for a maintained public investment for articulated democratic purposes.

Coalter et al. go beyond descriptions of the leisure planning and administrative systems, however, to utilise theoretical perspectives and historical analysis to explore the 'why' questions of leisure policy, questioning the nature of institutions, policies and the determinants of these, and pursuing issues of a political and ideological nature. They include in their wide ranging examinations of national and local bodies an assessment of the Sports Council, and three case studies of local authority recreation, drawing on interviews and documentary analysis.

A number of general conclusions are reached and further questions posed. Of particular relevance for pinpointing issues

relating to this study is their attempt to distinguish between rhetoric and practice, their identification of professional value positions, and their formulation of an agenda for discussion based on a politics of recreation. In the political rhetoric of leisure policy, they note that the theme of welfare has played an increasingly prominent role, but the practice of leisure policy has been based largely on responsive demand led strategies in which issues of 'need' and 'welfare' have a low priority. With regard to professional ideologies in local authority recreation, top management demonstrate a market oriented approach (a managerialist concern about cost effectiveness), while middle managers adopt a more welfare oriented view (concern about access and opportunities). In setting out an agenda for debate, questions are listed under a range of topics. These include 'Politics of Recreation as Welfare', in which they ask 'what are the consequences of a close identification of leisure services with policies of social control and social engineering?' and reveal that only in policies of the Sports Council - not the Arts Council or Countryside Commission - were ideas about the ability of leisure provision to provide solutions to such problems as vandalism and urban decay wholeheartedly espoused. The issue of 'Pluralism or Corporatism?' is also considered. Reference is made to political issues of accountability or control, concerning not only internal relationships between administrators and service specific professionals, but also the balance between supportive and directive social policies. They indicate that there are increasing economic and ideological pressures which may undermine the 'fragile pluralism'.

In many ways the report 'Rationale for Public Sector Investment' adopts approaches of critical analysis and raises issues which accord with this present study, particularly in the focus on political and ideological matters, on the contrast between policy and practice, and

the exploration of concepts like 'voluntarism', 'citizenship', 'pluralism', and 'corporatism'. However, there are several things it does not do. Firstly, it takes some documentary sources as a given - for example the official history of the C.C.P.R. and some aspects of the Wolfenden report. My enquiry looks again at some of these primary sources with a perspective and interpretation different from that of the original writers of these documents. Secondly, its status as a Sports Council/Economic and Social Research Council sponsored project, and its concern to open up debate, probably accounts for a cautious stance in its summary section, putting forward issues as open questions; my work is less strategic and more concerned with maintaining an explanatory approach throughout. Thirdly, it is wider than sport - embracing the arts, countryside and leisure in general, and does not focus or penetrate at the professional level in the same way. Fourthly, it tends to leave out the physical education aspect of sport in any detail after the 1930s; and it doesn't pursue the impact of the effect of the voluntary and state apparatus on the physical education body which helped establish that apparatus.

In this review of literature pertaining to the subject of sport and the state, each of the perspectives put forward has some relevance for framing the present study and the potential value and limitations of each has already been pointed out. In summarising key issues which provide a basis for underpinning the study, three aspects are underlined: the nature of capitalist society and the significance of economic conditions in shaping the role of the state in relation to sport; the dimension of power and the importance of understanding political and ideological forces which control and define sport - and how these are in constant movement; and the necessity of recognising the distinction between structure and agency, policy and operation, ideology and practice. The following sections aim to

identify and examine the main ideological forces in sport and their influence on it, and explore some key concepts for addressing sport in its relationship with the state.

Ideological Roots and Relationships: Humanism, Commercialism and Socialism

(i) Humanism

Just as conflict has occurred between humanist-liberals and the protagonists of industrial efficiency throughout the history of mass education in Britain (54), so in sport and physical education one can see evidence of divisions, tensions and accommodations between humanist views and commercial considerations - though of a different kind and within a different context and setting, and therefore with distinctive meaning for an understanding of ideological tensions in the cultural sphere of late capitalism.

Although physical educationists and sports practitioners may not themselves recognise a liberal-humanistic movement as such, it is clear that approaches to the subject - as indicated in statements about the curriculum in schools and colleges and the organisation of sport in society - signify a humanistic concern for the growth and development of sport. Prominent amongst these in the post-war period have been a number of the Birmingham University staff in the mid-1950s, the Wolfenden Committee of the late 1950s, the Department of Education and Science official subject views of the 1970s and 1980s, some United Nations (U.N.E.S.C.O.) reports, the ongoing writing of individual educationists in sport - like Peter McIntosh and Don Anthony, and others such as Chris Brasher in journalism and Philip Noel-Baker in international sports administration. The humanist stance in sport comes in a variety of forms and can be seen most clearly in its opposition to commercial developments.

In tracing the roots of this position, of particular significance is the 'amateur ethic' grounded in the organised games established by the 19th century British leisure class. The ideals of sportsmanship and fair play were contained in an aristocratic bourgeois philosophy of sport which Bourdieu (55) depicts as 'a finality without an end' - fair play being conceived as utterly opposed to the plebian pursuit of victory at all costs. This ideology of amateurism was enshrined in the Olympic movement established in 1896 and ran counter to the idea of government interference, professionalism and commercialism. Mandell (1976), points out that,

Along with the success of vulgar spectator sport and the aura of lucre surrounding it, professional sport was dreaded as a corrosive to what had been for only a slightly longer period a preserve of the leisured rich. The rich rejected money as a reward for sporting supremacy. A campaign to preserve an area of "clean" competition apart from and above the working class professionals dates from the mid-nineteenth century and it began among the rowers. Later the success of professional sport intensified the campaign to isolate it. (56)

And D. Young (1983) attacks the popular notion that the Ancient Games were the noblest example of pursuit of excellence for its own sake declaring that,

Amateurism is a modern concept originating in nineteenth century England to justify an elitist athletic system that sought to bar the working-class from competition (57).

He points to two examples. The 1879 rules for Henley Regatta stated that,

No person shall be considered an amateur ...
who is or has been by trade or employment
for wages mechanic, artisan or labourer (58).

The same three categories barred early applicants to the Amateur Athletic Club, which was formed in 1866 and later became the Amateur Athletic Association (A.A.A.).

The ideal of amateurism was upheld in the modern Olympic international movement - founded by the Frenchman Baron de Coubertin. From the start it deemed that 'strict definitions would apply. Money would be used only for organisation, facilities and festivities' (59). Paradoxically, however, Coubertin's conception of the modern Olympic Games as 'theatre' involving ceremonies, banquets, parades, speeches, presentation of awards, solemn assemblies, firework displays and torchlight processions has contributed to the event as a spectacle that attracts a world-wide spotlight and therefore lends itself to commercial interest - irrespective of whether the athletes are paid or not for their performance.

More recently (1956) in the seminal document 'Britain in the World of Sport' which provided a rationale and impetus for the establishment of a Sports Council, the Birmingham University Physical Education Department saw a positive role for physical education as guardian of the ideals of sport which it identified as British ideals, but which contain elements associated with amateurism. 'We believe', they argue,

that the 'spirit' of the game is
still very much alive in England.
It is indeed woven into the fabric
of our national life. The mutual
respect of adversaries on the playing

field and the tolerance of opposing political viewpoints are both British characteristics; both are part of our culture pattern ... But culture patterns change ... The coach is an influence for change ... We should like to see the spread of coaching closely linked to the physical education profession. Physical education which is concerned with all sports is less likely to get too concerned about one in particular ... physical education perhaps can exert a moderating influence ... (60)

An implicit identification is thus made with the old humanist moral position, but in defining the boundaries for future development a claim was being stated for physical education. A key question posed for urgent consideration by national bodies of sport at the time was, indeed, whether sports and education could operate together to re-state the ideals of sportsmanship and focus on them as a major aim of all sports participation.

One of the authors of this text, P.C. McIntosh (1979) continues this theme into the 1980s pursuing his fundamental belief that sport can and should be a civilising force of beauty and moral power (61). He argues that moral decisions in sport are inescapable and that if they are not made consciously and deliberately events will be determined by irrational forces. In his view, teachers of sport therefore have a responsibility in discussing the philosophical issues of, for example, violence and cheating in their presentation of activities to the young. Humanist ideals are thus seen in the moral values claimed for education in the sporting context - a notion that this represents 'true' sport is also conveyed.

It is generally recognised amongst sports administrators (62), that the fashioning of the present national structure of sport in Britain emanated from the deliberations and recommendations of the Wolfenden Committee on Sport and the Community (1957-1960).

The composition and general approach of the Committee is also important to consider in the context of the Liberal-Humanist view and its antipathy to commercial influence in Sport. It is reported, that its members were selected for their skill in evaluating evidence and arriving at impartial judgement (63). The Committee of nine certainly contained a number of individuals of high status, including three knights, a Bishop, a Director of Education, the Headmistress of Benenden School, a former H.M.I., an industrial welfare officer and a University Head of Department (D. Munrow, Birmingham University, P.E. Department) (64).

The strict impartiality of the Committee in ideological terms can, however, be questioned. There is evidence in the tone and substance of the report that the ethos of the Committee was one of social responsibility, civic duty and high purpose, and this although seemingly value free is itself bound to the vocabulary of 'progress and reform' with associated values of self-improvement, work and a social morality which largely eschewed links with commerce.

This is revealed in the ethical issues raised relating to amateurism, where the tendency for erosion of this principle occurs with payment of so-called amateur players, and on which the Committee expresses dissatisfaction (65); on national prestige, where the belief is communicated that on grounds of prestige alone it is better to lose gracefully and good humouredly than to win by sharp practice or unsportsmanlike conduct (66); on the press, where although acknowledging the help given to sport in the sponsorship and financing of events, practices such as ghost writing, excessive publicity for the very young, the distortion of events, and aggressive books to stimulate sales are thoroughly condemned (67); on Sunday games, where they discourage the development of organised commercial sport (68);

and on suggestions for finance from the betting pools, which are not endorsed because of moral objections to a direct link-up between the pools and amateur-sport, and the principle that earmarking of particular revenue for a specific purpose is undesirable and ineffective (69).

The Department of Education and Science in some of its statements also exhibits the humanistic approach to sport. At least, it has argued for a not too serious approach to sport in schools, advising that the competitive element of sport in primary schools should be kept within bounds; that undue attention should not be given to the more physically gifted, and that school sports days should be social events rather than too competitive, schemes of cumulative points or champions being avoided (70).

It is often difficult, of course, to establish how far such statements are meaningful; how important the concern to promote mass recreation is when it is one of a host of objectives which includes the pursuit of excellence and the production of gifted performers. The degree to which such statements and policies are supported in practice and the extent of financial backing are the kinds of criteria which may assist an evaluation of the force of these reports.

The value of physical education as an 'educational experience' is certainly defended by Her Majesty's Inspectorate - in the 1980s - over and against the emphasis by governing bodies of sport on the need for a skill training for later competitive performance. This is apparent with the Football Association's and Sports Council's attack on education. Through the England Football team manager, Bobby Robson, they have (in 1982-1983) presented a case for football league teams and professional players and coaches obtaining greater access to

young players of school age, arguing that football in schools is badly taught and this impedes the progression of English International football (71). The Chief H.M.I. for Physical Education, Denzil Flanagan, along with the English Schools Football Association resist this, emphasising that the concern of education is with developing young people through sport rather than producing footballers or other specialists (72). The educationists' apparent sensitivity is not that they are against the achievement of excellence but what the governing body influence stands for: the values of the professional club and the associated commercial world of ends justifying the means in the search for success. In this respect this friction indicates not only the protection of the education sector from infiltration from mainstream sport but another form of the humanist-commercial division.

The humanist idealism in sport is particularly evident at an international scale, not just in the Olympic movement but in governmental organisations. In addition to the stated concerns about professionalism and commercialism, the slogans of 'world peace' and 'international understanding', 'world citizenship', 'fair play', are associated with the United Nations Educational and Scientific and Cultural Organisations (U.N.E.S.C.O), the Council of Europe (particularly in its European Sport for All Charter) and the International Council of Sport and Physical Education - all Governmental Organisations concerned with the development of sport (73).

U.N.E.S.C.O. has formed a permanent Intergovernmental Committee known as the Interim Intergovernmental Committee for Physical Education and Sport comprising representatives of 32 nations. In putting forward principles and considerations following its inauguration it stated that,

educational aspects of physical activities and sports must remain the key feature as distinct from ideas of sport of a selective nature at a high order of competition

that,

action should aim to ensure access to and general participation

and,

special attention should be devoted to opportunities for women, the elderly and the handicapped (74).

The Council of Europe - a political organisation consisting of the majority of countries within the geographical area of Western Europe - through its Committee for the Development of Sport (C.D.D.S.) was responsible for drafting a 'European Sport for All Charter'. This underlines the concern about the dominance of competitive sport and the need to counter this. Paragraph 3.3. states that,

Even when it has spectacular features, competitive sport must always aim in accordance with the Olympic ideal, to serve the purpose of educational sport, of which it represents the crowning epitome. It must in no way be influenced by profit-seeking interests (75).

A number of questions need to be raised concerning the rhetoric of these governmental bodies. Although they are holding with the ideals of Olympism in regard to its amateurism, but against the high level of competition, do they really see Sport for All (or educational sport) as entirely separate from championship sport? Are there other reasons for the involvement of governments in sport apart from the apparent distaste of profit-seeking interests? Why is it that these anti-commercial values are put forward by government bodies when governments of capitalist countries are usually concerned to enhance the potential for new markets in new fields including sports?

How does this position fit in with the contrasting policies of the British post-war Governments in their construction of a Welfare State and the hegemony of Social Democracy, and the authoritarian populist Thatcher Government from 1979 with its ideology of private enterprise and the declared policy of Conservative Ministers of Sport (Hector Munrow then Neil MacFarlane and Richard Tracey) that sport should aim to seek greater financial aid from the commercial sector? Indeed, can the humanistic focus and its adherents be seen as totally at opposite ends of the continuum from the commercial sphere and its agents? Does not liberal humanism in sport actually support the possibilities for a market approach, if not intentionally, then through the creation of an increase in mass participation which itself leads to potential for the provision of facilities, equipment and other services which may be exploited by profit-seekers? To what extent are commercial considerations replacing the traditional dominance of liberal educational ideas? If they still continue, how far has capitalism succeeded in incorporating humanist values in sport?

Such anomalies and contradictions abound when comparing the claims of humanist positions with the realities of sport, and these have become more apparent as competition has intensified and sport at elite levels has been marketed as entertainment. By the 1980s the discrepancies were becoming so evident that business agents were openly scoffing at the Olympic movement and Royalty was pointing to the difficulties of sport's connection with commerce. Mark McCormack, President of International Management Group, which is involved in the personal management side of tennis, golf, athletics, fitness and team sports stated (1985):

Sport is a business ... Certainly it's competition and it's all the pure and wonderful things you read about since you were a kid, but it's a business! ... The Olympics is the biggest business

of all - the biggest sham in many ways
because it purports to be an amateur
competition - which you know is a joke! (76)

The blurring of the humanist and commercial values, but also a realisation of the tensions between them, is encapsulated in the following statement by Prince Philip (1984) where the connection is both legitimised and regretted. He comments:

There can be no objection to people making a living out of sport, provided the sport is not corrupted by commercial considerations. There can be no objection to the use of sport for advertising provided the enjoyment of the participants is not affected. But the sad thing is that the moment money comes into sport the whole atmosphere is changed. Winning becomes more important than sportsmanship (77).

Government also seems to be caught between these values, and specific instances of the position of politicians will be considered at different stages of the study.

The reality definers in the transition in sport in the 1950s and early 1960s and its shift towards a closer relationship with politicians and the state apparatus were from what I have called the liberal-humanist movement. David Munrow and Peter McIntosh (Birmingham University) and Philip Noel-Baker M.P. had connections with the International Council of Sport and Physical Education as early as 1952, shared the concerns that sport was becoming divorced from physical education, and helped pioneer the 'Sport for All' and 'Sport and the Community' orientation (78). This group included members with acknowledged humanist convictions: McIntosh and Madders (Birmingham) and Noel-Baker were Quakers - and this was said to have had echoes with Sir John Wolfenden. This group (Munrow, McIntosh, Noel-Baker) also had a strong socialist inclination and close links with the Labour Party, including a contact with Denis Howell who when

becoming Minister for Sport in 1965 found roles at National level for a number of the Birmingham University Physical Education staff. Munrow became Chairman of the Sports Council's Sports Development and Coaching Committee. McIntosh was first a member then Chairman of the Research Committee; Denis Molyneux (also Birmingham University) was appointed Deputy Director of the first Sports Council - with responsibility for Research (79).

However, although the personal and collective views of this group may have had an influence in the early development of the Sports Council in the 1960s in terms of the expansion of coaching schemes and increased participation (80), it would appear that the voice of education and humanist concerns in sport receded - though not entirely - by the 1970s as the preoccupation with efficiency, administrative structure and the greater intervention of politicians took effect (81). Furthermore, although the motives of the humanists may have been genuinely fixed on the higher moral values and purposes of sport this does not mean that the subsequent advancement of facilities did not serve a purpose for the state in its stage of development. Account needs to be taken of the legitimacy needs of the state and of the value to the social democratic political underpinning of the 1960s and 1970s for both Labour and Conservative Governments in 'fostering equality of opportunity, achieving a degree of cultural democratisation, and creating a sense of community through welfare programming.' In addition, appropriate funding of the welfare state through a co-ordination of private and state contribution was a background force of some significance. John Hargreaves (82) - drawing on Castells and Offe - argues that the 'Sport for All' campaign exemplified this strategy by evening up inequalities in participation through a limited expansion of collective consumption, and assimilating collective and private consumption by promoting sport and

physical recreation as a family-centred form of entertainment. It is doubtful, however, whether such a strategy was pursued by the liberal-humanist group for the reasons as indicated here; rather that their definition of the purpose of sport was acceptable within the framework of the overall political social democratic thrust and useful to the state in these terms.

(ii) Commercialism

A second social force was that of the business-industry connection with sport, expressed in the growing commercialism in the 1970s and the market ideology of the later 1970s and 1980s. Sport itself was becoming transformed by these developments. Commentators on sport continually point to the commercial encroachment. 'The seventies is probably the last decade of amateurism', wrote John Rodda (1979)

As the eighties approach there are hundreds of athletes who can see the possibilities of creating wealth through their sport, and not even the Olympic movement can ignore the money market (83).

John Arlott (1979) remarked that,

No decade of cricket history ever saw more changes than the 1970s. The game's economic, international, administrative and playing shape and some of its most cherished values were so altered that it can never again be remotely what it was even as late as the 1960s (84).

Others like Brasher (1979) urged sports bodies to go along with the trend, arguing that,

If the governing bodies do not move into the central role of promoting their own sport, control will shift into the hands of independent promoters whose *raison d'être* is profit for themselves or their company ... you the governing bodies cannot beat them so join them ... (85).

Don Anthony (1980), former Olympic athlete, physical education lecturer and consultant to U.N.E.S.C.O. and the Council of Europe adds to this, declaring that,

Our ideology will recognise also the involvement of industry and commerce in sport. Commercial thinking can be imaginative and lively; sport needs it, but it cannot rely entirely on the whims and fancies of the market-place. It must have a permanence and continuity which only institutional backing can provide (86).

The relationship between sport and industry has a longer history and deeper meaning than that provided by the concerns and opportunistic statements indicated above, and in order to understand the significance and role of business in relation to sport and the state some comment and analysis is required on the production-consumption dichotomy of work and leisure and of the 'social construction' of commercialism in sports institutions from the late 1950s.

The idea that work and recreation are two polar-extremes is a commonly held view which has persisted for many years. The separation of work from leisure has historical roots in the puritan ethic of the Reformation period which - as Weber explains (87) - by inculcating a belief in the sinfulness of idle pleasures, provided the ideological basis for the formation and development of capitalism. The compartmentalisation of work and leisure experiences developed with the growth of industrial capitalism (88). The establishment of sport on organised lines in the nineteenth century both reinforced this division and brought sport in touch with industry for the first time on a mass scale. On the one hand, the amateur principles of an aristocratic elite and intellectual middle class continued to see sport as a recreational disinterested pursuit which was distinct from the worldly side of life; yet, the re-introduction of sport to the

masses through professional football and other team games meant that sport became established as a commercial enterprise (89). The two elements still persist. Inglis (1972), for instance, regards sport as the antithesis to work (90). But whereas he sees this as an opportunity for freedom in sport, Fergusson and Mardle (1981) draw attention to the problematic nature of the implicitly taken-for-granted dichotomy of work and leisure: work (wage labour) being discerned as the site of productive activity in which the public person relates in the public work role in a public setting; and leisure (time away from work) as centrally devoted to consumption performed in the private social grouping - the family (91). It is mainly the consumption aspect of leisure and sport which relates it to business and industry.

In terms of the social construction of the sport-business association three dynamic features are evident: the creation of sport as a product, the development of a marketing approach in sport, and the fashioning of a case for the social basis of investment.

The idea of sport as a product is related to the use to which sporting endeavour is put. As Brohm points out, sports clubs operate like firms competing on the sports market. Players and athletes become workers who sell their labour power - ability to produce a spectacle that draws crowds - to employers (92). In contrast Inglis argues that sport is not a product as it is not presented as the direct producer of material wealth. He points out that its economic structures are non-productive, and that it is a social practice rather than a product - an artefact (93). On the other hand, the sporting occasion or event can be said to have a material value which can be sold for a profit - and Inglis gives ample illustration of the growth of economic practice in sport (94); and contemporary economists like

P.J. Sloane (1980) refer to 'entertainment' as the product of sport (95). It is in this sense that sport as product has been created by a process of capitalisation of a popular cultural practice. The creation of the practice is the first stage in this process and builds on to the values inherent in the naturalness of play reflected in the premise of the Wolfenden Committee Report that 'since society began "man" has played', therefore it is worthy of support by the nation (96).

However, the enterprise of provision for both national athletes and mass recreation was a large-scale endeavour which required financing: facilities had to be built, services provided and land bought and sold. As Gruneau (1984) points out, 'in a capitalist economy, any large-scale sporting activity will involve at least some commercialisation' (97). It is clear that in the late 1960s and early to mid-1970s the support of the public sector - local authorities - was seen as the major target, though it was also policy 'that there must be full co-operation between industry and the local authority'. It is also necessary to recognise that although local authorities were seen by both the Labour Government 1964-70 and the Conservative Government 1970-74 as the key sector for an expanding recreation provision they were themselves in the field of 'big business'.

There were, in the main, two factors which shifted sports administrators closer towards business and commerce: one, the costs of competing at international level and providing for physical recreation; and two, the changing character of sport itself in the process of expanding media interest, sponsorship of top level competitive events and the developing professionalisation of leading athletes. This led sports administrators increasingly towards the marketing of sport as a commodity - but particularly so when the new

Conservative Government in 1979 decided positively to encourage commercial investment. Particular demonstration of this has been the Sports Council's Ten Year Plan published in 1982 which indicates a resource need of £215 million in the first five years of the programme (1983-1988) (98). Although the targets set out by the Council assumed some increase in real terms in the resources made available by Government, the scope for an expansion of commercial investment was underlined.

Linked to this strategy is the development of a marketing approach in sport, and the Sports Council indicate very clearly their growing attention to this exercise. The interest of sports organisations in achieving greater efficiency, their pre-occupation with management methods, and a greater professionalism in line with the general corporate approaches of the late 1960s and 1970s, have more recently been supplemented by a vigorous attention to aggressive sales techniques. This is evident in the more sophisticated promotion of display and advertising material for events and campaigns, but also in the professed promotional strategy of the Sports Council which aims to increase participation particularly amongst those who would not normally consider taking up sport given more free time. What lies behind this development will be more fully explored in the following chapters. However, at this point, it can be stressed that the Sports Council is certainly concerned to compete with other interests in securing more non-participatory clients to engage in some sporting activity indicating that,

there will have to be a battle of the mind to induce some of the other groups to take part: a battle that has to be fought with information, marketing and leadership (99).

The identification of the market and the potential benefits to be gained by business are given some attention by the Sports Council (100). It refers particularly to the great expansion of indoor sport since 1960, and the significance of this in creating a mass market for recreation, competition and the purchase of clothing and equipment where none existed before. What is also interesting is the comment that, 'the new public facilities provide a base for this growth'. The public government-sponsored sphere of sport is thus acknowledged to be in league with and supportive of private capital investment. Furthermore, the way ahead is directed by the encouragement for commerce to exploit the 'potentially profitable area for private investment' in private, less crowded and more sophisticated venues. Partnership between public, voluntary and commercial groups is advocated with suggestions for breaking through into hitherto little-tapped sporting markets - amongst young mothers, housewives, older people and manual workers.

A further dimension of the sport-industry association is the rationalisation and justification of its social benefits. A more efficient work force, a cheaper alternative to medical treatment, and reduced costs on social disruption are three arguments which have been put forward since the turn of the century with varying responses (101). They are also included in the strategy for sport in the 1980s and though it is regretted (by the Sports Council) that at present it seems unpopular to account on this social basis for public investment - irrespective of political persuasion - the official stance of that body on this matter is nevertheless disclosed.

A significant change has accordingly occurred in the manner in which sport is offered to the public and consumed in the 1980s compared to the 1950s. This is evident in the language and vocabulary

and the objectives and concerns of official statements of national bodies (102); it is apparent in the administrative structure within which sport functions (103); and it is discernible in the practice of administrators and officials, national athletes and games players and public participants and viewers - including the young adult and school pupil (104).

It is to be argued that these changes have something to do with the nature of British society: that is a society of late capitalism which is undergoing transformation in coping with crisis, of a long standing but gradual decline of the British economy; and in the steadily increasing presence of the state which is assuming a new dimension - even with the free market strategies of a Conservative Thatcher Government where the state may be less outwardly visible than with the social democracy of labour. Indeed a key feature of this centrally directed policy is the legitimising of business and enterprise.

The role of sport in the resolution of capital's problems is problematic, however, in that with the degree of autonomy it enjoys government influence may not necessarily be guaranteed. There is always the possibility that governing bodies will not conform to Government wishes, as over the Moscow Olympic boycott issue, or the Football League's apparent disregard of Mrs Thatcher's desire for greater controls and business efficiency in football management. It would appear anyway that although statements have been made by Conservative Ministers of Sport - Munrow then Macfarlane, Tracey and Moynihan - that greater commercial contact is necessary in sport, this may not be followed through very efficiently in practice. Further, it is considered by Sports Council international authority that the traditional amateur values and commonsense view of sport as non-serious have in Britain - until recently - acted as a barrier in the promotion of sports goods to overseas markets (105). The economic and ideological levels have been moving at different tempi, though this may be

changing with the free market ethic of Thatcherism and a new re-actionary commonsense.

To regard the key individuals or groups who stand for a private - commercial-market ideology as a clearly defined or cohesive body in sports administration would be difficult, since there would appear to be a number who have come to accept the nature of what exists in the wider society - i.e. of a strong presence of commerce in sport - as being a desirable thing to promote. The dominant view in the Sports Council thinking from the later 1970s seems to have been more a politically expedient and pragmatic approach than working for greater justice, moral standards or control by the players and athletes.

However, the shift to a strengthening of a private-market perspective has received a firm lead from the top. The Minister for Sport, Neil Macfarlane, and the Chairman of the Sports Council, Dick Jeeps, pressed for greater contact with representatives of selected firms to discuss co-operation between the private and public sectors (106), a consultant on sponsorship has been contracted to the Sports Council (107), and the marketing of sport has been more vigorously pursued - as exemplified in documents like 'Sport and the community - the Next Ten Years' (108) and 'Identifying the Market' (109).

However, although elite competitive sport is becoming highly commercialised and there has been a steady growth in sponsorship in sport from the early 1970s (110), aid to sport from the commercial sector has not been forthcoming to the extent the Sports Council wishes. But this seems not to have diminished the Council's interest in commercial links and a recent success was claimed with the 1985/1986 campaign to attract 13-24 year olds, 'Ever Thought of Sport?' involving poster and radio advertising, backed by professional organisation and sponsored by Weetabix Limited (111).

What this particular commercial connection illustrates, however, is the fusing of the commercial and humanist elements as an aspect of the objective of increasing participation in sport, which is a key feature of the Sport for All movement. Sport for All has become incorporated into Sports Council policy which has shifted under political influence: first, in the 1970s, from generally fostering the development of sport and physical recreation to meet peoples assumed wants in the widest sense, to more explicit instrumental social objectives - of bridging gaps between ethnic groups, and ameliorating juvenile delinquency, violence and vandalism (112); and then, in the 1980s, towards a more business-commercial thrust and direct role of the Minister for Sport in formulating policies which were even more focused on social problems of unemployment and unrest in the inner cities (113).

The incoming Conservative Government of 1979 and reshaped Sports Council - post 1978 - had in fact, recognised the value of Sport for All and the apparent egalitarian social objectives. Indeed from 1982 onwards the amount devoted to community provision in revenue and capital terms was increased considerably (114) and the Minister for Sport, Neil Macfarlane, expressed concern that the extensive sums received by sport in commercial sponsorship seemed not to be reaching the grass roots of sport (115).

However, this has to be reconciled with the larger changes being effected by an authoritarian government in undermining traditional communities and shifting resources to the privileged (116); it also indicates the pursuit of sport in meeting the legitimisation function of the state and the concern that many sections of the population - the young, over 50's, women for example - drop-out or reject sport and physical recreation (117). Nevertheless, the complexity and interplay of the different ideas and movements has to be acknowledged, and the emergence of critical reports and papers which has drawn attention to the Council's grant-in-aid being weighted in favour of elitism (118), and of conference proceedings and books which demonstrate the sexist, ageist and racist

nature of much policy and practice in sport (119), is also a significant factor in affecting the response of policy makers.

In evaluating the impact of Sport for All from 1966 to 1984, Peter McIntosh and Valerie Charlton suggest that it has travelled too far along the continuum from sport as a means of useless enjoyment (the liberal view) to sport as social machinery (both a social democratic and neo-conservative - new Right - position). McIntosh and Charlton indicate their preference for the return of 'Sport for All' to its roots in promotion being based on enjoyment rather than social function, and that a social policy for sport should be based on twin principles - of health and enjoyment - expressed in two slogans: 'Fit for Life' and 'Sport for Fun' (120).

(iii) Socialism

There is another form of resistance to the dominant position of state regulated sport which can be seen as a more recent dimension of a tradition of dissent, and although it exists largely outside the corridors of the Sports Council and Government Departments it has connections with the state through local authorities as the municipal socialism of the 1980s. In order to understand the roots of this position in sport vis-à-vis the state it is relevant first to state that popular sports and pastimes in Britain have, since the transition to industrial capitalism, been shaped from above, involving the bringing to bear of co-ercive and moral pressure on subordinate groups. From the reconstructed folk games regulated and centralised in the mid-Victorian era through to state provision of 'drill' for working class children in elementary schools in the 19th century to the political and business intrusion in modern sport and even the social engineering of Sport for All, it is apparent that sport and recreation has been planned for rather than by the people that

use them (121). Prescribed needs have been formulated even more precisely in the 1970s and 1980s, than in the post World War II period.

However, there has been a history of reaction and struggle against this domination from above - which is manifesting itself again in the 1980s. The Social Democratic Federation in the 1890s pressed for necessary facilities for full mental and physical development for children, which covered not only the necessities of life such as food and clothing, but also swimming baths, gymnasias and playing fields (122). At the 1905 Trades Union Congress, a resolution moved by Wil Thorne declared in favour of the principle of state maintenance of children - including physical training for all (123). It is important to note, however, that although the T.U.C. recommendation for the appointment of medical officers led to the setting up of a Medical Department of the Board of Education and a strong therapeutic orientation for physical education in schools, the state organ incorporated the working class pressures into more liberal and conservative objectives.

During the inter-war years, resistance to middle and upper-class dominance in sport was also evident, though it failed to establish any ground in Britain compared to continental Europe. The struggle of the rambling movement for access to open-land was one of the most notable examples of resistance. Indeed, this was an indication of working class challenge to the land-owning interest's power to limit the use of the countryside particularly in the North of England. Resistance was apparent in the mass trespasses at Kinder Scout and Abbey Brook in 1932 organised by the Lancashire District of the Workers Sports Federation to combat prohibition from access to land in the Peak District. However, the law was invoked to put down this protest, and the leaders were gaoled for their part in it (124).

The Labour movement showed some interest in sport in that it established its own official body, the British Workers Sports Association at a conference convened by the T.U.C. General Council in 1930 for the organisation of sports activities for its members. But in political terms its activities appear not to have been very significant, and it concerned itself mainly with the organisation of sports meetings (125). The Communist Party-linked British Workers Sports Federation formed during 1927-1928 was rather more politically active through its publication the Worker Sportsman, focusing on access to facilities, the improvement of facilities and the opportunity for Sunday football (126). Direct connections between sport and politics were also made through the Clarion Cyclists Club who would arrange cycle rides with stops for political discussion and meetings. One of the themes of the Federation was its opposition to militaristic youth groups.

A further instance of political statements from the Left was the reaction by Labour M.P. Aneurin Bevan (largely confined to a comment in the House of Commons) to the Physical Training and Recreation Bill, 1937. He argued that the Government was pushing physical training on the masses for national well being because it was easier and cheaper than providing the facilities and playing fields which the upper and middle classes already enjoyed (127).

However, the main thrust of the struggles focused on the narrow one of access, which was in line with the dominant Labour thinking during the inter-war period. The common theme of resistance was agitation for the provision of facilities. The aspect of control was to some extent debated (within the Workers Sports Federation, and in Aneurin Bevan's comments), but the preoccupation with facilities dominated, and since this was also the aim of the middle ground and the sports fraternity generally it was something which voluntary bodies, private benefactors and

government could share in. In this way it could divert radical attack to a common cause which could be generated through the more established federation of voluntary bodies like the Central Council of Recreative Physical Training with which the state could liaise - as it did from 1935 - through the Ministry of Education (128).

Although there has been resistance to the consumer values of the 1960s, through alternative practices of youth cultures and particularly through football hooliganism, which Clarke interprets as a colonisation of the sanitised and professionalised provided form dominated by big business (129), there has been little or no representation (from the 1950s to late 1970s) of a radical socialist kind in sport in its contact with the state. However, in the 1980s, there has emerged a much greater consciousness in some Labour controlled local authorities amongst a younger breed of elected members that the needs of communities in relation to sport can only be met by a radical reassessment of the provision of sports facilities based on the communities' real interests and needs, and of the particular character of women, ethnic minorities, the disabled, the unemployed and the over 50's.

In London especially, since 1983 the Greater London Council through its Arts and Recreation Committee and Sports Sub-Committee established a policy of priorities to deprived areas, minority sports and underprivileged groups - particularly women and ethnic minorities (130). It also identified ways of effecting the re-distribution of resources in proposals to intervene through London local authorities in the commercial organisation in sponsorship of sport, in the sports clothing and footwear industry and in professional spectator sports clubs and private sports clubs. As Atkinson argues (1983), in debate initiated by the G.L.C. Department for Recreation and the Arts,

It is vital that local authorities make some resistance to the susceptibility of sport to financial dictates, consumer pressures, sexist ideologies and selective definitions which commercial organisations put on sport (131).

His criticism of local authorities is not that they are unresponsive - in a changing emphasis in the 1980s - to the problems of women, ethnic minorities, the unemployed, the handicapped and disabled and elderly. Indeed, the Sports Council journal, 'Sport and Leisure' (132), also demonstrates an increasing awareness of deprived groups. But, as he argues, the consequences of playing sport under a market economy have not been fully grasped. That is, an understanding is required of the massive influence of the mass media and commerce in its ideological work of emphasising elitism, selectivity in male dominated sports and stereotyping of black athletes.

A further dimension of resistance is evident in the strategy of 'decentralisation' in local authorities like Birmingham and Sheffield as well as the Greater London Council. On return to power in Birmingham - in 1984 - Labour put forward the decentralisation of services (including Leisure facilities) by providing neighbourhood offices, and the devolution of power through the establishment of Area Committees, as twin objectives in meeting its overall aim of 'Community Participation' (133). Sheffield's Labour City Council - in 1983 - stated, in relation to Recreation and Sports, that it was their major manifesto commitment to increase usage and involvement in facilities by working people and that they would also seek to involve, at some stage, workers in the management of these facilities (134).

Whilst these are important developments to be examined in more detail at a later point of the study, it is necessary to recognise the

competing forces and of the problems - already indicated - of egalitarian aims becoming absorbed in their application in contexts and environments which reinforce the dominant elitist, sexist, racist and ageist values; or even if these aims are realised in provision of facilities or community participation or extra public resources, they may be separated off from and not really alter provision for an elite which continues to receive backing from private and commercial means and still dominate the way sport is presented to a mass public through the media with its selectivity influences of what is important in society. Indeed, a crucial issue in the future for the various interests and political attachments - humanism and the liberal consensus, commercialism and the market orientation of the new radical Right, municipal socialism and the counter culture of the Left - is whether they can identify and turn popular experiences and emergent attitudes and aspirations to their advantage. In the 1960s and early 1970s the liberal-conservative consensus and social democratic influence dominated. The main beneficiaries have been the better off sections of the population - the middle and upper class males. The elite sector of sport has gained most in the distribution of Sports Council grants (135), and some commercial interests have taken advantage of sponsorship for advertising and state subsidy in developing sports schemes. Since 1979 and the return of a Conservative Government, welfare programming has been replaced by cost cutting and a privatisation and recommodifying of sport and recreation services making them more of an individual and family responsibility. Political capital has also been made by government of conflicts occurring in sport, particularly those relating to issues of law and order and provision for inner cities, thus exploiting the area of mass recreation for the defusion of social interest (136). More recently, from about 1983, a counter movement to the radical right policies of the Thatcher Government seems to be in the early stages of development in some Labour controlled authorities attempting to redress the emphasis on central direction and towards greater community

provision and involvement; and in a few instances (e.g. the G.L.C. until 1986), identifying the issue as a matter of attitudes and practices as much as facilities and equipment (137). However, it is also important to take into account not just the statist approach and the idea of the providing state as the bearer of socialism, but of movements of self activity in civil society itself. Stuart Hall (1984) points out that the current craze for body maintenance and the widening concern about questions of health and exercise - as demonstrated by the popularity of Marathon running and aerobics - not only links with environmental pollution worries, but appears as a spontaneous movement in civil society ahead of rather than sponsored by 'the authorities' (138). Although local authorities in general have certainly picked up on these interests and provided financial support for their development, it is not evident as Stuart Hall argues, that the Left and the labour movement has until recently sufficiently grasped the connection of this more personalised and apparently apolitical form of environmental impulse - which includes sport and recreation dimensions - with a wider development of strategies which 'addresses the mass common experience, and connects with the perspectives of the whole society' (139).

Thus it can be seen that the sport-state relationship is a transitional one in which the terrain is constantly being re-shaped by competing definitions. I have identified these as an ideological tension between three forces: liberal-humanism, commercialism and neo-socialism focusing on the historical process and pinpointing the problematic factors which have emerged in sport and which have a connection with the interests of the state.

Key Concepts: Collective Consumption, Corporatism and Hegemony

I would emphasise that I am not attempting to develop or use a general theory of the state in this study, nor am I relying on one school

or single theory. Nevertheless, it is clearly necessary to construct a theoretical account to provide a deeper level of explanation of the problematics already identified, the transitions pinpointed and the social forces advanced.

In this task I have been concerned to draw on concepts from a range of perspectives on the state which relate to the economic, the political and the ideological and which have specific relevance to the interest association of sport. In addition to taking account of the accumulation, political and legitimation functions that the state performs for capital - as developed by Habermas (140) - the concepts which have stood out in my examination of theories of the state as being of particular significance are those of "collective consumption", "corporatism" and "hegemony". I shall here expand on their meaning and application to sport and the state, and assess their scope for analysis of my empirical material.

The concept of collective consumption, originally developed by Castells (141) to assist the analysis of struggles to secure low cost public housing in France, has been subsequently generalised so that it can refer to state-subsidised or managed amenities and services which have become accepted forms of provision particularly in urban settings. Mass consumption of leisure goods and services - including sport - has certainly become a concern of both capital and state, through business sports agents, the government aided Sports Council and local authorities as shown in the priority given to facility provision and active participation from the Wolfenden Report (1960) to Sport in the Community - the Next Ten Years (1982).

However, the collective consumption of sport is problematic. On the one hand the growth in provision of sport and recreation services may be a response to pressures - political and professional - for perceived welfare needs of the public; yet it has since the 1960s been unequally

distributed. This has occurred through concentration on traditional activities and forms which have been more accessible to middle and upper working class groups; and in the 1980s, by eroding the relative quality and extent of provision in the public sector through policies of commodification - privatising by contracting out public facilities to private operators who charge economic costs, the selling of recreational land by local authorities, and commercialisation, in which the selectivity of sponsors means that certain popular sports are excluded and a majority of participants do not benefit. There is also the paradox that attempts to counter the tendencies towards commodification may actually lead to a legitimisation of the prevailing system. For although Whitson (1984), drawing on Castells and Offe (142), argues for politicising collective consumption in order to achieve a quality of collective goods and services on a more equal and wider scale, it is possible that the resulting material gains may deflect from more fundamental political changes of aiming for democratic control.

As Jeremy Seabrooke maintains (143), the achievements of the working class in the post-war era have been largely material advances, but bought at the price of damage to the spirit of solidarity, co-operation and sharing that exemplified the older working class communities - that transformation has taken place with human lives having taken root in the products and commodities of capital and its culture. In effect that the working class resistance has been weakened through a materialist conception of progress. And just as Seabrooke recognises that the Labour leadership may only have intended the best for their class - that it was not a defection of love or commitment, rather a failure of understanding at a deeper level of the consequences of an optimistic progressivism, so the liberal humanist movement of sport and its labour affiliation of the 1960s would appear to have genuinely worked for the development of sport and its greater expansion - though perhaps in a fairly gullible and unimaginative fashion.

A further point in this debate, in which I am evaluating the collective consumption concept in its transitional form, is the argument - as expressed by Hall (1984) (144) and Willis (1983) - that socialism needs to understand the modern forms of solidarity in the current stages of capitalism, and to recognise that socially, culturally, in everyday economic life younger people set enormous store by choice and diversity; that there are innovatory trends in culture which operate at the small end of the market; and that the danger to these popular initiatives is not only big commercial providers but regulations by the state elite (145).

The essential point is that a politics of collective consumption of sport which focuses largely on access to and quality of recreational facilities, without a change in the way these are controlled, may be more prone to appropriation by the ideology of the market and possessive individualism. What is needed is a focus on the deepening of democracy and passage of control to the consumers. Whitson acknowledges the importance of a wider struggle than statism and change within a reformed state policy in considering the politics of recreation and the role of leisure professionals in the 1980s. As he argues,

in a period of attack on the public service, the only effective opposition to the interests of capital will be one which unites the interests of all those who work in the public services, with all those who depend on their work, an opposition which can only be undermined by ideologies of "professionalism" which divides workers from clients (146).

But his use of collective consumption in theorising struggles over everyday life stops short at the point which envisages the powerless taking the initiative.

Nevertheless, the concept usefully relates to sport and state intervention; it also - through the politicisation of collective consumption - constitutes a confrontation between consumer or client and capital; and by focusing on a recognition of interests across a wide spectrum - housing, schooling, travel and sport and recreation provision, and conversely the recognition of conflicts of interest with the priorities of capital, it suggests a basis for new alliances in a broadened class struggle.

However, as well as examining the way in which capital relates to state and civil society through the process of consumption, it is necessary also to look more closely at the state apparatus and its particular relationship to sport in its forms of representation, how this has changed, under what conditions, and what effects this has had on the interest association of sport and its representatives and members. Some of the key changes have been pinpointed earlier in the Chapter. These include the more directive role of the state in affairs of the organisation and financing of sport, the closer relationship between business and sport, and the depoliticisation capacity that sport exercises as a result of the closer state intervention. These changes have occurred through sport as an interest association seeking support and organisational subsistence; and in turn the state has institutionalised and incorporated sport conferring on it public status and responsibilities. These tendencies are not incompatible with the pluralist notion of associations advancing the interests of their members.

However, pluralism conceives the state as separate from civil society and interest associations. The pluralist description may be more appropriately applied to the sport-state relationship in the pre 1960s state of sports development, (though elements of pluralism may still exist

and this needs to be located). It is, however, the situation in which public policy functions have been carried out by an established structure of sport in the early 1970s that the label corporatist may be used - though some further consideration of the term is required before relating back to the apparently 'corporatist' changes indicated in the previous paragraph.

Crouch's summary of areas of key agreements on the subject of the corporate state in the last decade, indicates a number of important dimensions of meaning contained in applying the term corporatism to activities of the state (147). In particular, that corporatism is best regarded as a strategy pursued by capitalism when it cannot adequately subordinate labour by preventing its combination and allowing market processes to work. In this pursuit it involves hierarchical control of organisation, regulation by the state and a high degree of normative integration. Corporatism is thus a class concept, belongs to the analysis of capitalist society and is generally viewed as an economic system of the Right. The state's activity has also to be seen as part of a wider pattern of development in industry in which units of production became larger and more concentrated and in which small producers are taken over by or merged with larger corporations.

J.T. Winkler (148) points out that the essential element of corporatism is not the extent of intervention by the state - a quantitative notion - but qualitative change, and in particular the shift from a supportive to a directive role for the state in the economy. Winkler's typology includes the roles of facilitative (where the state performs regulatory and supplementary functions); supportive (where the state intervenes, but does not interfere) and directive (where the state establishes national goals, controls the allocation of resources, provides some co-ordination of supply and demand for important goods and services and regulates the distribution of reward). Winkler's outline of the types

of role the state may perform has some utility in characterising the shifts that have indeed occurred in the increasing involvement of the state in policy for sport in Britain since the 1930s. However, it is a 'top-down' model which emphasises the style adopted by the state but does not explain the dynamic process of ideas and political practices in the relationship between sport and the state.

Further considerations for assessing ideological and practical aspects of state activity in relation to sport are pinpointed in Newman's (1981) work on corporatism in which particular stress is laid on the facets of tripartism (of state, industry and organised labour as a principle of organisation), depoliticisation, extra-statutory dimensions (the quangos) and social welfare (149). The appropriateness of the description of corporatism would, according to Newman, depend on the degree to which these elements existed.

Newman sees evidence in sport and recreation of corporatist tendencies, notably in a greater involvement by the state, in the quasi-statutory role of the Sports Council, and in policies and practices which have the effect of depoliticisation. He does not, however, recognise much involvement by the business sector or organised labour in leisure organisation. Yet, as I have argued in presenting a preliminary analysis of the business and commercial connection with sport, there is a significant practical and ideological link which has become more apparent in the 1980s. And although organised labour may not be so evident, this does not mean that it has not been so in the past, nor lessen the need to investigate why this earlier connection has faded. And, as I have also shown, there are signs of a new municipal socialist (decentralist) movement which relates to sports provision.

A relevant point made by Streeck (150), in assessing pluralism and corporatism in German business associations and the state, is that

corporatist or neo-corporatist interest intermediation requires that organised collectivities be sufficiently removed from their members and sufficiently close to the state - or more generally the public realm - to be able to share in the production and implementation of binding allocational decisions. To this extent the process of becoming more corporatist and more distant from members of the sports administrative fraternity let alone the sports clientele renders a corporatist form of representation open to the criticism of elitism, hierarchy and exploitation.

A number of questions can be addressed through examination of the administrative structures and forms of representation which have not already been answered; and using the corporatism concept in this research the sport-state relationship is investigated in more detail with empirical material obtained in the study of national, regional and local environments. The following issues have been raised in my enquires: although there are practices in sport as an interest association that indicate a corporatist form of representation, would it be accurate to regard sport as a fully fledged form of corporatism or just partially corporatist - perhaps only in style of operation? How far has the government's commitment to corporatist approaches influenced the style of corporatism in sport? Is there a strategic design in the sport-state relationship, or is the situation more a series of disjointed incrementalist responses to emerging problems? Is the corporatist approach equally evident in national, regional and local contexts? What kinds of gains have been achieved and what losses have been incurred in the styles and practices adopted? Can sport claim both official status and autonomy - its ideology tending to be corporatist and pluralist at the same time, depending on the environment addressed? What elements of pluralism remain? How did the Conservative government post-1979 alter the form of representation and mode of approach? Has a corporatist emphasis

been fully overtaken, and if not what aspects remain? These issues will be explored in the following chapters.

However, in order to focus more explicitly on the institutional mediation of ideological practices in sport, the dialectic of co-ercion and consent in relation to state power, the nature of popular-democratic antagonisms as well as class struggles and the strategies of the movement towards socialism, it is necessary to go beyond the consumption and corporatist notions. It is here that the studies of Gramsci - and particularly his concept of hegemony, have most relevance.

Although Gramsci attributed the fundamental determination to the economic structure, he regarded the social, cultural, political and ideological levels as critical in providing the conditions for capitalist production to proceed. By hegemony is meant the ongoing exercise of domination by a leading class or established group through popular consent, which is achieved by ideological work and by material accommodation to subordinate groups, thus reinforcing an acceptance of their subordinate position. It is also important to note that the struggle for liberation from this domination must stress the task of creating a 'counter-hegemonic' world view, or what Gramsci called a new 'integrated culture'. Both the terrain of the state and civil society are crucial components in understanding the hegemonic process in sport, and particularly the former where different power elements interact.

Although the cultural area of sport has lacked much recognition by academics following a Gramsci or Neo-Gramsci framework of analysis, as indicated earlier recent work by John Hargreaves (1985) (1986) (151) has begun to address the issue of state intervention in sport and the role of hegemony focusing firstly on how legitimisation of the social order is maintained by depoliticisation - through the twin programme of 'Sport for

All' and 'Excellence', and secondly on the process of politicisation - through direct political intervention of specific episodes like the Moscow Olympic boycott, football violence and the boycott over apartheid in South African sport. Hargreaves concludes that state intervention in sport tends to lend support to the prevailing pattern of hegemony in reproducing the divisions between subordinate groups - between upper and lower working class people, between blacks and whites, between men and women, divisions which disorganise and weaken them viz-a-viz dominant groups - and in simultaneously encouraging subordinate groups to bind themselves to dominant groups within the national community and at the local community level. In rejecting both the prevailing pluralist orthodoxy that the state is a neutral mechanism enabling all interests to be equally represented, and the orthodox Marxist conception that the state is a mere instrument to ruling class conspiracy and determined by the mode of production, Hargreaves presents a position which looks at the complexities and contradictions in state-sport relations, distinguishing between policies of the government and the Sports Council. A number of insights are made, including the point that

the most significant aspect with regard to hegemony was the fact that social democratic programming, the main proponent of which has been the Labour Party, failed to involve the working class as a whole; it reinforced the relative disadvantages under which non-white ethnic minorities suffer; and it did relatively little to equalise opportunities for women;

and, that

state intervention works at the ideological level to reproduce the very inequality between ethnic groups it purports to be trying to eliminate. By targeting programmes on young blacks, i.e. by treating this group as a special

kind of problem, while at the same time the structural basis of its discontents are effectively ignored, it implicitly attributes the cause of racial conflict to black youth's frustrated response to their unequal position, rather than to that unequal position itself (152).

However, whilst Hargreaves provides a useful framework for analysis and makes some important points of argument there is a tendency to rely largely on annual reports and general policy documents for evidence. A more detailed examination of practices at both national and local level is required to link with the ideological work identified. At times, too, he is inclined to give the impression of the Sports Council being a homogeneous group, when as I have indicated earlier, there is a tension between the different interests and movements - Sport for All, elite sport, commercial developments, and sport as entertainment.

In addition, in his earlier writing he fails to pursue the hegemonic process to the point of consideration of the transformation of the subordinate position of deprived groups. There is an absence of any notion of struggle, strategy or liberation - which is a persistent theme in Gramsci's work, and which is necessary to provide a fuller picture of the social forces involved. This is, however, more developed in his most recent work - Sport, Power and Culture (1986).

Hargreaves, nevertheless does show how the transition from Social Democracy to Authoritarian Populism has been hegemonised in Britain since the 1960s and how state intervention in sport has contributed towards this shift, though there is perhaps a greater central direction evident in sport in Britain in the mid-1980s than he appears to recognise.

The political theorist Nicos Poulantzas was influenced by the work of Gramsci in consideration of the role of hegemony, and, as Jessop (1982) points out, he applied it creatively to the organisation-direction of a power bloc and emphasised the important role of political practices as well as ideology in constituting hegemony (153). It is relevant to note Poulantzas' explanation of the authoritarian changes in the state brought about by its greater economic role as this is modified through the political situation. The outcome, he argues, has been that state bureaucracy has replaced the parliamentary base as the principal site in the elaboration of state policy under the aegis of the political executive (154). Concentration and centralisation at the summits of the governmental and administrative system with greater influence by the office and personality of president or prime minister was judged to be the developing pattern in the 1970s of capitalist states, and this has proved to be a prescient analysis when applied to the British situation - as demonstrated by the increasing intervention of the British Prime Minister and Minister for Sport in the Olympic Boycott issue 1980 and the control of football hooliganism in 1985. However, according to Poulantzas, in the consolidation of authoritarian statism a sharpening of political crisis and state crisis is likely with a partial polarisation of the increasingly politicised permanent administration to the Left - especially among lesser officials, who tend to be more in touch with the masses - and a weakening of the effectiveness of the administration in securing hegemony (155). It is in this process of working through the experiences of tension and conflict of a hegemony of authoritarianism that the erosion of ideological hegemony becomes possible. However, it is by no means inevitable that the periods of upheaval in sport will lead to new forms of consciousness and a greater movement for democracy in sport or civil society as a whole. As already indicated, it has to be worked for. In the 1982-86 G.L.C. policies on Arts and Recreation there were signs that a local state was attempting to decentralise and redirect power to the periphery through

genuine community leaders and community groups. But at the same time, as Stuart Hall (1984) points out, the New Right of the 1980s exemplified through Thatcherism has been far more successful than the Left in connecting with popular movements - including sport and recreation - and this is particularly so in the subtle way that it has identified the positive aspirations of people for freedom from state bureaucracy with the market and the restoration of the capitalist ethic, and to present this as a natural alliance. Hall presents the issue as a struggle between Right and Left - providing the latter becomes sufficiently aware - to turn popular cultural experiences and emergent attitudes and aspirations to its own benefit (156).

What is important as an underlying theme in employing the concept of hegemony is to focus on explanation of the strength of the liberal and radical right positions, but also to consider ways in which alternative movements have attempted to and might still gain ground even when the old regime still seems firmly established in power. An analysis is required which addresses the capacity of the capitalist system to incorporate cultural areas for its overall purposes of expansion, and which examines, in particular, the extent to which sport has provided legitimacy support for the ideological construction of a business and enterprise state orientation. At the same time it is important to assess the contradictions which make the successful achievement of the entrepreneurial hegemony problematic, thus identifying the scope for alternative strategies.

In summarising this theoretical framework for the study, it is important to underline that the aim is to relate theoretical understanding to day to day sports and recreation activity. It is also intended to illuminate the relationship between sport as an interest association and the institutional dimension of the state. And, in

addition, underpinning the selection of appropriate perspectives and concepts is the objective of interpreting the transitions which have occurred in this relationship - and which might be developed in the future - thus combining analytical and strategical dimensions.

The focus of the study is the analysis of the transition in sport, of the forces which have shaped it, and the interests which have been served. It is argued that significant changes have occurred in the manner in which sport is offered to the public and consumed in the 1980s compared to the 1950s. This is apparent in the language and vocabulary of official statements of national bodies, in the administrative structure within which sport functions, and in the practice of administrators and officials, athletes and spectators. The thesis identifies the transformation as a movement in which the close association of the organisation of sport with education has shifted under government and business influence towards an instrumental welfare role for the state, and towards a privatised entertainment-oriented practice linked to business and media influence. The aim is to explain these developments through a consideration of economic, political and ideological factors, and to assess the practical consequences and operations through an examination of policy discourse and its outcomes at national and local level.

The survey of literature in the sociology of sport and related areas indicates a range of approaches that can be taken, and these have been presented under four perspectives: pluralist, social reproduction, culturalist and state investment. The pluralist perspective (utilising the work of Roberts) essentially sees the state as neutral, adopts a liberal or conservative view and argues for maintaining the present system

with minor adjustments. The social reproduction perspective (based on Hoch and Brohm) focuses on societal power and the structures which maintain the existing system. It indicates how natural inclinations for play become subverted by state and business; it highlights the competitive aspect of sport and critically examines the values of capitalist society and their existence in sport. The culturalist perspective (which covers in this review, Cantelon and Gruneau, Hargreaves, Hall and Clarke and Critcher) provides a dialectical interplay between power, ideology and resistance in which an analysis of the state is central, but where the autonomous nature of sport and its scope in a popular politics of civil society is emphasised. The state investment perspective ranges from a commitment to educational solutions (Anthony and McIntosh), to a municipal socialism (Whannel), to a re-examined role for state provision from Leisure Studies contributors (Bramham and Henry, and Coalter, Long and Duffield). The inadequacies of both pluralist and social reproduction accounts have been underlined, and the scope for a deeper and more flexible analysis through culturalist critiques has been emphasised. The value of contributions included under the umbrella of state-investment has been the accent on the shaping of prospective forms of public provision by political interests - either by assumed liberal positions or more explicit socialist strategies.

The terms 'physical education', 'physical recreation', 'sport', and 'state', as well as the role of sport and state in 'depoliticisation' are used frequently throughout the thesis. It is not the intention to provide a prescriptive common meaning for these terms to be applied to all references to them. In some instances they are used specifically to denote, for example the physical education profession, physical recreation training or the Sport for All campaign. But they are also contested terms, and sport can be variously defined to emphasise its role in self-development and progress, (the Olympic ideal - Anthony), as a microcosm of

society which stresses its competitive nature (Brohm), or as entertainment (Peter Lawson, CCPR General Secretary states that at top level sport is no longer sport but entertainment - The Observer, 22 August, 1982). Indeed, it has been shown in tracing the ideological roots and relationships in sport and the distinctive meaning given to it by humanist, commercial and socialist values that it is a cultural sphere of socially constructed practices.

Similarly, apart from denoting specific (governmental and quasi-governmental) institutional bodies the state has a range of meanings, or at least is given a prominence in different ways as indicated in the literature review: as a neutral balancing mechanism (the pluralist view); as a combination of forces, between state, capital and labour to incorporate the working class by involving it in long term planning (the corporatist approach); as an interventionist apparatus to maintain class relations (the social reproduction interpretation); as a hegemonised institutional practice drawing on coercion and consent to legitimise power relations (the culturalist perspective).

The study draws on the variety of meanings attached to the state, examining the way in which sport at its different levels has been influenced by the state, and in turn has utilised and defined its own position. In this sense a disaggregated view of the state is taken. Sport may have been used by the state to distract deprived groups from pursuing more political objectives (that is, to effect depoliticisation), but at the same time sport has provided certain groups and individuals with opportunities for pleasure, status or material gain.

In relation to the central theme of the study, it is maintained that sport has served an instrumental purpose for the state as a social palliative for economic problems, and that this instrumentalism has been

clearly linked to the liberal ideology which has been in tension with the growing dominance of the ideology of commercialism.

In practical terms, the influence of professional physical educationists was prominent in the establishment of a national co-ordinating apparatus for sport as a mass physical recreation movement in the 1930s and in the advancement of this body close links were developed with the state Education Department. However, the efforts of the physical recreation movement to expand and develop in a sporting context and to obtain increased funding from the state led, following the deliberations of the Wolfenden Committee on Sport, to the education based administrative affiliation with the state being severed and a system constructed whereby - in the event - a Minister for Sport and a Sports Council took control of planning and co-ordination.

This had several implications. The Labour Party, which argued strongly for a Sports Council and was concerned with developing a long term planning perspective in line with its corporatist approach of the 1960s, actually brought about bureaucratic and centralised conditions in the organisation and administration of sport with strong personal direction by the Minister of Sport as self-appointed Chairman of the Sports Council. In addition, whilst providing increased benefits for some governing bodies of sport - in for instance the development of their coaching schemes - this led to the intensification of competition and the negative effects of sport, which the early education and liberal oriented pioneers of the recreation movement had been at pains to combat. The Conservative Party, on the other hand, though outwardly arguing for greater freedom from Ministerial control for the Sports Council actually reinforced and used the greater central control of the state through the terms of a Royal Charter in 1971 - binding the Sports Council more closely as an agency of the state.

By the late 1960s/early 1970s the development of sport, through state support, attracted the increased attention of the media and business and commercial agencies. This had the effect of shifting the ideological terrain fragmenting the more liberal humanist domination towards values of accountability, profit, efficiency, privatisation and commodification. In this process, the professional representatives of sport responded pragmatically and opportunistically constructing a meaning for sport and promoting it under the banner of social engineering.

These shifts in sport also acted back on education and the physical education profession. Teachers and lecturers had to adapt to an identity change. The teaching profession was certainly exhorted to respond to the local state developments in the formation of recreation departments and indeed to consider itself as the 'social engineer' in the service of the community and leisure provision. Education, in effect, came under attack at different periods: during the late 1950s in the attempts to broaden developments from physical recreation to mainstream sport and as a means of gaining greater access to the corridors of power at national level and of increased state funding; in the late 1960s and 1970s in the re-organisation of local government, the expansion of community recreation and the opening up of facility provision; and in the 1980s when the commitment to competitive sport in schools was being questioned from the Left - in criticising the value of requiring pupils to take part in sports events which emphasised competition, and from the Right and Centre - where concern was expressed about traditional values and standards being eroded and potential talent for mainstream sport being undeveloped. Education and physical education both adapted to these pressures and utilised them opportunistically. On the one hand the changes of structure and values had profound effects in altering the nature of practices, but at the same

time some educationists and physical educationists took advantage to embark on new careers to gain resources and to secure status and power. The following chapters aim to provide a detailed analysis of these issues and processes.

CHAPTER TWO

HISTORICAL CONTEXT 1930 - 1960

It was argued in the opening chapter that the sport-state relationship is a transitional one in which the terrain is constantly being reshaped by competing definitions. The dominant features of contemporary sport identified were the growing influence of the state and the market: amateur sport and physical recreation had become transformed by forces which had shifted it from a principally educational phenomenon to one in which welfare and entertainment were the prevailing characteristics. But the involvement of the state in sport although more clearly evident with the establishment of an advisory Sports Council in 1965, was also apparent in the development of the national voluntary movement in physical recreation from the 1930s. Indeed, it was in the period from the mid-1930s to the late 1950s that official definitions of post-school physical activities were shaped by the interaction between politicians, civil servants and recreation administrators, and became legitimised in terms of the social and educational benefits which it was considered could result through involving young people in organised recreative training.

However, the idea that recreation could be used to achieve political and social purposes was not a new phenomenon. Bailey (1978), in his study of 'Leisure and Class in Victorian England', uses the term 'rational recreation' to convey how recreation was exploited as a measure of humanitarian relief and an antidote to political subversion in the Chartist era. He also points out that rational recreation became more

than an exercise in repair or pacification: it became part of the ongoing and fundamental re-socialisation of the working classes (1). Hargreaves (1986) draws attention to the way in which sport in particular played a significant part in the re-education and reformation of the popular classes in the 19th century, thus helping to maintain the growing economic and political power of the bourgeoisie in industrial Britain (2). There was a continuity with this theme in the period 1930-60. Cultural practices - including recreation and sport - were indeed fundamentally linked to the economic and political changes of crisis and growth, and served to maintain the existing domination of a middle class order. It was at this stage that the legitimisation functions of sport became manifest in the context of how under specific economic conditions the state turned to the cultural pursuits of physical training. The problems of the state apparatus in the 1930-60 period were related in sequence to economic recession, recovery and growth, of contraction, then expansion, and this had an impact on political and cultural responses. Questions of concern to politicians included, at various stages in this period, ways of containing the effects of high unemployment, how to occupy deviant youth in activities deemed socially desirable by establishment standards, and how to engender the desire for national spirit and achievement at a time of economic recovery. It is argued in this chapter that these concerns helped to form the terrain on which post-school physical recreative training was established, and on which negotiation took place between recreation administrators and their patrons and government officials.

However, a critical understanding of the relationship between the economic, political and ideological forces requires reference to theoretical underpinnings. These are to a large extent contained in the perspectives presented in Chapter One. The social reproduction perspective in particular, focuses on the nature of capitalist society; and although the deterministic approach limits its capacity to account for

a diversity of social conditions and practices, its emphasis on the structures and processes of capitalism provides a reference point for analysis which takes account of the economic conditions in the 1930-60 period. A relevant variant of this paradigm - in the tradition of critical theory - is found in the work of Habermas (1976) in Legitimation Crisis. Whilst his writing focuses on the tendencies in the shift from liberal capitalism to advanced capitalism from the late 1960s, his development of the concept of crisis and explanation of the relationship between the economic, political and socio-cultural systems offers a framework for assessment of the legitimation functions of sport at an earlier period. He argues that if the political response to economic crisis fails the withdrawal of legitimation occurs. He also maintains that a legitimation crisis is based on a motivation crisis - that is, a discrepancy between the need for motives declared by the state on the one hand, and the motivation supplied by the socio-cultural system on the other (3).

Habermas also emphasises the importance of the state ensuring motivation towards cultural interests to provide legitimation for the capitalist system to achieve its other major objective of accumulation (4). However, it is essential to avoid the generalisations evident in the work of Habermas, and to take into account the complexity of political processes and events relating to sport and recreation. As argued in the previous chapter, sport should be seen not as a homogeneous phenomenon, but as a plurality of activities and groupings. The changing or continuing patterns of domination within these are bound up with ideological and political forces, which in turn are influenced by economic requirements of the changing needs of capital. However, the outcome of these influences is variable. It is necessary, therefore to analyse and interpret the interaction of these forces in sport in the 1930-1960 period.

The kind of analysis to be adopted takes into account the importance of a dialectical understanding of the relationship between the providing authorities and participants, between the state, recreational bodies and public. It is held that provision was not a crude imposition from above, but a response by establishment which yielded to identified popular needs and interests for physical recreation. At the same time it would appear that the form of provision reflected the influence of middle class voluntary bodies and of the state seeking to gain political advantage. Analysis is therefore required which penetrates beyond the outward appearance of state support and voluntary interest as a phenomenon either of direct control or liberal development and progression, and in this context a number of questions are raised. In particular, why was a national co-ordinating body for sport and related interests set up in the 1930s at a time of economic crisis and depression? Who was involved in this and what interests were served? To what extent and with what effect did state departments play a part? How far and for what purpose did the central bodies of sport and recreation focus on youth as a special group in the 1940s and 50s. Was there any link with liberal humanism, commercialism or socialism in the development of sport in the 1930-60 period? What was the nature of contact between establishment and official bodies and the citizen population? What was the effect of policy on the practical response in terms of awareness, support or resistance to the provision of recreation opportunities?

The historical analysis aims to provide a background to an understanding of sport and the state relations after 1960, which forms the main focus of the study. It also attempts to critically examine the economic, political and ideological dimensions of the voluntary and professional movement of physical education and recreation as a significant part of the explanation of the transitions in sport. In this sense it is more than a background to simply show how we got where we were in 1960.

Unemployment, Voluntarism and Physical Recreative Training

A number of distinctive movements - conjunctures - came together in the decade from 1930 in relation to sport and recreation: the capitalist world recession, with high unemployment and attempts by governments to regulate the economy; the threat of war with Germany; the growing popular interest in post-school recreation; the commitment of professional and voluntary bodies to the development of physical recreation; and the state's increasing involvement in the sphere of culture (5). It is not the intention to give equal treatment to these different movements, but rather to recognise their importance in relation to the main focus of the study.

In terms of the economic background, Britain in the 1920s and 1930s was suffering from the decline of its older industries which together with the competition from other nations was threatening the dominance which it had held in the nineteenth century. The general adversity of the world slump and the New York stock market crash in 1929 was expressed in reductions in wages and in unemployment which in Britain reached an all-time record figure of just under three million by the beginning of 1933 (6). In some areas it was particularly intense. In mid-November of 1932 the general level of unemployment was 22.7 per cent (and 27.3 per cent among men), while in Durham it was 42.5 per cent (46 per cent among men), in Glamorgan 41.6 per cent (44.6 per cent among men) and in Monmouthshire 45.3 per cent (48.3 per cent among men) (7).

Sport, or at least recreative physical training (which included sports activities) featured as one of the possible ways of coping with the depression (8). In ideological and political terms the ruling establishment identified Physical Training and Recreation as a useful social palliative. The Times saw the need for preventive work through the

provision of correctives and antidotes to the depression of mind and body, and appealed for a movement which would instil the values of self-help, self-discipline and self-development (9). The National government through the Labour Prime Minister, Ramsay MacDonald, called for public spirit, the personal obligations of a common citizenship, and self-reliance to overcome supineness (10). An announcement had already been made of Government plans to combat the effects of prolonged unemployment upon young men by an experiment in the provision of physical training under the general supervision of the Ministry of Labour (11). The Government had earlier - in 1927 - declared physical training to be

a natural and convenient means of teaching the value of mutual co-operation and assistance and of laying, through individual effort and work in association with others the foundation of an understanding of good citizenship (12).

and in 1933 it re-asserted that,

in exceptional conditions of unemployment, poverty or economic distress it is particularly necessary to safeguard mental and physical health by means of wisely directed physical education of the body (13).

Stanley Baldwin, a leading member of the National Government from 1931 and Prime Minister from 1935 to 1936, had also advocated improved facilities for recreation on the grounds that it would bring about closer relations between social classes (14).

It would appear that the mental, or the behavioural, aspect was as much, if not more a concern of the establishment of the day than the physical condition of the masses. This is evident in the focus by The Times on citizenship and qualities of self-reliance, alertness and self-discipline of the individual for the sake of the common cause (15).

It is also evident in the argument of the Board of Education that the mind-body distinction should be transformed, and indeed that 'mind had been recognised as a partner with body' (16). The Times saw the expression of this union as being identified with the quickened and quickening interest in all kinds of competitions in which brain and muscle co-operate (17), and in the value of games and contests as a higher form of physical culture through the ingredient of 'training' and 'discipline' (18). The credit for the changing awareness of the close connection between body and mind was attributed by The Times to Lord Baden Powell and the Scout Movement which, it argued, demonstrated 'the work of training and the excellent discipline provided by games' (19). The liberal values of self-improvement and conservative concerns about physical deterioration of the race and the deterioration of imperialistic enthusiasms in the people were indeed very much built into the Scout movement in the early part of the century, as Samuel Hynes points out in his history of the Edwardian period (20).

These statements of opinion, intent and policy objectives indicate that in the severe conditions of the early 1930s physical training and recreation were perceived by various branches of the state as a viable area to promote. For a modest expenditure it could perhaps bring returns, not just of physical health, but of depoliticisation through the inculcation of values of self-help, co-operation, and national unity, tapping a popular interest in sport and physical recreation which was developing rapidly. There are also a number of other meanings contained in these declarations, which appear to be communicated as fairly broad generalisations based on common-sense assumptions about what physical activities stood for, but which actually embody specific cultural definitions.

Firstly, there is a casual use - particularly in reports in The Times - of the terms 'physical recreation', 'education' and 'training' and the role of 'sport and games', which tend to be used interchangeably or

generically, but which do stem from different traditions and have a distinction which is socially as well as technically significant. There is, as McIntosh (1968) points out, a dichotomy between, on the one hand, 'recreation', which has involved games, sports and pastimes and an association with the nineteenth century Public School system of education; and on the other hand, 'education', which has involved physical training, systematised exercise and a link with the state-aided elementary schools (21). The exhortations of establishment bodies seem to be combining both recreative and educational traditions, of sporting and training functions, in which the muscular christianity of character development implicit in the athleticism of team games in public schools is merged with the authoritarianism of prescribed routines in the drill-like schedules of state schools.

Secondly, there is a conglomeration and looseness in the listing of values - by government bodies, individual politicians and press - of what might be achieved through engaging in physical recreation and training. It is possible, however, to distinguish three ideological positions in the statements cited: liberal progressivism is evident in the concerns with self-help, self development and self reliance; conservative authoritarianism is apparent in the emphasis on training and discipline; and ideals associated with socialism are discernible with the use of phrases like co-operation and unity. There is no suggestion, however, that there was any notably active ideological debate or tension. As Hobsbawm points out, the Labour Government of 1929-1931 was strong on the rhetoric of socialist aspiration but rejected any policies to do with unemployment which conflicted with the current economic orthodoxy of Treasury advisors (22). In addition, the formation of a coalition National government in 1931 and the development of liberal oriented Keynesianism meant that the more dominant influences were liberal and conservative. The key ideological message in the statements of the establishment in relation to post-school physical recreation would appear to be in emphasising the discipline of training for the improvement of the masses under the banner of liberal progressivism or conservative authoritarianism.

The Sports and physical education bodies did not by and large demur and some actively responded to the kinds of exhortations described above. The Women's League of Health and Beauty in 1933 included in a public demonstration of movement activities at the Albert Hall a mime symbolising the reconciliation of Capital and Labour (23). Unemployed men drawn from the North of England, Scotland and Wales, members of Service Clubs and Occupation Centres - established by the Government - took part in physical training lessons at the newly opened Carnegie Physical Training College, Leeds in 1933 and 1935, under the auspices of the Leeds Education Committee and the National Council of Social Service (24). The Yorkshire Post reported that the course was designed not only to bring out latent skill in leadership in the ranks of the unemployed but,

to cultivate a spirit which will be of the greatest value when it is spread in industrial areas throughout the country (25).

Such claims have to be treated cautiously. After all, the 1933 course involved fifty three men only and the 1935 course forty seven, and it is difficult to measure how far these individuals helped cultivate any special spirit amongst the unemployed in their home areas.

A more significant response in terms of long term effects in the development of the administration of sport and recreation was the initiative taken by the Physical Education profession, led by Miss Phyllis Colson, Organiser of P.E. for the National Association of Girls Clubs and supported by the two major associations - the Ling Association of Teachers of Swedish Gymnastics and the National Association of Organisers of Physical Education - in the setting up of a national voluntary co-ordinating organisation for physical recreation. The individual motives of Miss Colson are clearly described by H. Justin Evans in the commissioned history of the organisation - the Central Council of Recreative Physical Training - which was established in 1935 (26). However, the political and ideological significance of this development has not been explored in the conventional histories, where there

has been a tendency to descriptive history, highlighting events from the viewpoint of recreation professionals but not providing sociological critique, providing data but not penetrating to an analysis of power and domination (27). Two aspects of the early development of the recreative physical training movement would appear to be important in political and ideological terms: firstly, its legitimisation function for the prevailing political hegemony of liberal capitalism; and secondly, its effect on the power relations of the occupational body of sport, physical recreation and education.

The value position and the activities of the Central Council of Recreative Physical Training upheld the hegemony of liberal capitalism, both in the way it defined its goals, and in its relationship with established institutions and individuals. The underlying philosophy of the C.C.R.P.T. indeed adhered to a liberal progressivist approach. It was essentially promoting the idea of activity not just for physical self-improvement but for mental health. As Lord Astor, President of the C.C.R.P.T. - as well as owner of the Observer Newspaper - stated following the formation of the Council:

Many young persons deteriorated physically when they no longer had organised exercise as the discipline of school and the enforced idleness endured by many had sapped their mental and physical alertness. It should be their endeavour to put that right (28).

The C.C.R.P.T.'s formally stated aim was indeed to improve the physical and mental health of the community through physical recreation (29). In making arguments in support of grant application to the Board of Education it also indicated the belief that its schemes would 'do much to establish healthy physique and sound mental and moral traits among the community as a whole' (30). The claim that its activities could also establish sound moral traits reinforces the affinity of the stated values of the organisation with a liberal progressive ideology.

In addition, the Council attempted to secure close connections with establishment bodies, including state departments - and to obtain patronage from the highest ranking individuals - including Royalty. Alliances were established by the C.C.R.P.T. with a number of groups: with the Board of Education - particularly Herwald Ramsbotham, M.P., Parliamentary Secretary to the Board, and Sir George Newman its Chief Medical officer; with national organisations such as the British Medical Association and national voluntary youth organisations; governing bodies of sport; and with prominent individual politicians. In turn the C.C.R.P.T. from its inauguration received encouragement and support from the Board of Education at the highest level, and formal relations were developed through the Board having a liaison officer serving on the Council (31). The British Medical Association also helped the C.C.R.P.T.'s cause through a policy of encouraging voluntary organisations to use its services (32). A range of Youth groups registered with the Council from its earliest beginnings, and reflect the extent of the C.C.R.P.T.'s connection with formally organised bodies - the respectable and regulated recreation movement (33). All the major sports of the time were represented (34), and it is interesting to note the names of at least six Members of Parliament on the Council's individual membership list (35).

At the outset, the C.C.R.P.T.'s mission was concerted national action and a co-ordinating though voluntary emphasis. It saw itself as an establishment body having obtained Royal Patronage - apparently through the efforts of its Board of Education contacts (36) - and with ambitions of working in close conjunction with the state. Indeed, it placed its services, and hence those of sport and recreation, in the hands of the state declaring its hopes that it may be allowed to play an active part in whatever national policy is adopted by His Majesty's Government (37) and

indicated that it would be available to place its increasing experience at the disposal of any local authority (38). This liberal statism and collectivism, of unity and co-operation fitted into the changing attitudes towards the role of the state in the early and mid-1930s and the Keynesian influence in the management of the economy. As Stanley Baldwin commented in 1932,

There was no question that the state could do much to provide favourable conditions and that all parties were committed to a degree of intervention in the life of the individual which would have seemed excessive or tyrannical to Bentham (39).

And, Sir Hilton Young (Minister of Health) emphasising the value of preventive medicine to the British Medical Association drew attention to the development of physical culture in Europe and America which was built into the social structure, and argued that Britain should be making a concerted effort to make as much progress (40). The C.C.R.P.T.'s approach contained a broad support for this consensus. Its dedication to self-interest and voluntarism revealed a more traditional liberal position, whilst its themes of nation, standards (of fitness) and duty reflected a conservative stance (41).

The Government demonstrated its clear interests in facilitating developments in the increased provision for recreation by issuing a White Paper on Physical Training and Recreation in January 1937, in which it justified its proposals to introduce special measures for supplementing the activities of the many voluntary and other agencies in the field on organisational and financial grounds. It was stated

that without some measure of central co-ordination of effort the provision must necessarily be sporadic and incomplete, and that the funds available from all sources are insufficient to cover the ground as fully as is needed (42).

As a result, two National Advisory Councils (one for England and Wales, and one for Scotland) with Grants Committees were established in 1937 under the Physical Training and Recreation Act.

The Minister responsible to Parliament for England and Wales became the President of the Board of Education, and a National Council (which became known as the National Fitness Council) of about 30 selected men and women, nominated by the President of the Board of Education, was set up as the controlling authority. Full-time staff for the National Advisory Councils and Grants Committees were furnished by the Government, mainly from the staffs of the Board of Education and the Ministry of Health. The Government thus became involved in developments for the provision and extension of facilities for physical training and recreation through establishing an administrative and funding apparatus. It was argued that without such a co-ordinated scheme they would not do more than touch the fringe of the problem of provision. At the same time it was indicated that they would fail in their purpose unless the fullest use was made of these arrangements by the existing agencies, whether voluntary bodies or local authorities (43).

The political significance of the Government's action in this area applies to and can be interpreted at two levels. In terms of support for the political hegemony of the evolving liberal state of the 1930s, then in the cultural sector there was a compatibility with the increase in intervention which was occurring in the management of the economy. By taking steps to increase provision for recreation, it was also maintaining

legitimation for the existing system which had been threatened by the problems of unemployment and the resulting increase in working class support for union action - epitomised in the 1926 General Strike and its aftermath. With regard to the organisational control of interests in the field of recreation the Government's scheme had implications for the role and ambitions of voluntary bodies - particularly the Central Council of Recreative Physical Training - and this became more evident as the National Advisory Council's initial plans appear to have included an attempt to incorporate the voluntary C.C.R.P.T. This second political feature relating to the government's involvement in setting up an apparatus for administrative advice and the disbursement of funds will be explored again later in this section in relation to the power dimensions of the occupational groups in sport, education and recreation. At this point it is important to consider, in relation to the working through of the political hegemony, the extent to which the policies of the C.C.R.P.T. and the National Fitness Council, and their attempt to increase the physical and mental health of the nation, were put into practice and with what effect.

The C.C.R.P.T. itself was clearly active from its birth in 1935. In reporting on its progress in April 1936 (44) it stated that advice had been given to voluntary organisations, local authorities, groups and individuals from both urban and rural areas on such matters as the formation of physical recreation centres, the type of activity suitable for different ages, the organisation of training centres, classes and demonstrations. In its executive work three categories were identified - matters connected with leaders, classes and demonstrations. Included in the work with the training of leaders was the active co-operation sought with all physical training and other colleges and the compilation of a national register of leaders. The development of keep-fit classes was furthered through assistance in their formation, and introduction to

centres to the hundreds said to have made enquiries as well as sponsoring and initiating new groups - one hundred and thirty of which were advertised under the auspices of the Central Council including those in factories, guilds, laundries and offices. Local education authority physical training organisers and head masters were instrumental in assisting such classes, particularly in Sheffield, Rotherham, Huddersfield and Swansea. Similar developments were described in January 1937 and a C.C.R.P.T. minute dated 30th November, 1938 detailing requests from Area Committees throughout the country for visits from C.C.R.P.T. representatives reveals that the work of the C.C.R.P.T. was stimulating further demand (45).

Although these developments give some indication of the range of activity of the recreation movement there is little or no material from which one can accurately assess the direct effect on the general population. Clearly, as already shown, there was more investment in recreative training than the early 1930s, but many of the official reports were produced for the purpose of selling the C.C.R.P.T. with a view to making a case for further investment in material resources of manpower - for the Council itself - and equipment (46). What proportion of the population actually attended such classes? What percentage of youth attended youth clubs where physical recreation was practised on a regular basis? Where they did, what physical or mental changes resulted? Such statistical exercises appear not to have been undertaken at this time. However, a survey in 1939 made on behalf of King George's Jubilee Trust of the adolescent citizens of Britain by A.E. Morgan (47), involving a study of records and observation of youth organisations, led to the conclusion that discussion of the desiderata of physical activities over and against passive forms of amusement was largely academic since only a minority of boys and girls took part in any form of regular physical training or organised athletic activity. The enthusiastic efforts of teachers, the

increasing attempts by youth organisations, the contribution of the Playing Fields Association and certain local authorities in providing facilities and the grants made by the national Fitness Council were acknowledged, but summed up by the comment that, 'when all is said and done it makes a poor showing ' (48). W.McG. Eager of the National Association of Boys Clubs also pointed out that the National Fitness Council had not become a national movement in the full sense of that term (49); it was little more than a movement for increasing opportunities for personal fitness. But most boys did not possess the desire for fitness.

However, the energetic concern of central government in facilitating developments in the provision for physical recreation and training in the late 1930s would appear to have been linked to wider international political motives than ameliorating the problems of unemployment. Although the National Fitness Campaign was civilian rather than militaristic - the main emphasis being to work through youth organisations - nevertheless, a crucial factor behind it would seem to have been the realisation that with Hitler in power in Germany war was an increasing possibility, and that Britain's general national fitness compared unfavourably with the fitness promoted by youth movements in Germany, Italy and Russia. The arguments and publicity for preventive health, the importance of providing compensatory activities for the unemployed, of encouraging self-help and assisting towards national unity - all seem to have played a part; but the concern with national fitness in relation to international politics and the defence of liberal democracy is more likely to have stimulated the Government into such immediate and specific action in 1937.

Sir Hilton Young, Minister of Health (50), Lord Hampden Chairman of the C.C.R.P.T. (51) and Mr. Oliver Stanley, President of the Board of Education (52), all drew attention to the impressive standard of physical

culture in the authoritarian states of Europe. The 1936 Olympic Games held in Berlin provided a spectacle for Germany's Youth movement and the place of athletic festivals within this. In moving the vote for the Government's new plans for physical training in February 1937, Mr. Oliver Stanley held that this was not a party issue and argued that apart from the obvious reasons for supporting the development of physical training and recreation there was a more indirect but greater importance - the defence of democracy. The Times reported his comments in this context as follows:

It would be idle to disguise for themselves that they were facing a great challenge to democracy. They tried on both sides of the house to defend democracy, but all the best speeches and arguments were a very indifferent defence. There was only one real defence, and that was to make it work, to show that they could equal the mechanical advantages of dictatorship while still retaining their own individual freedom to think, to understand, to decide (53).

In this respect foreign considerations in the later 1930s began to influence domestic policies, but so too did international capital movements and recession in the 1920s and early to mid-1930s. In both cases there was a threat to the prevailing system, and the physical condition of the nation was identified as an aspect of concern. But not just for bodily fitness. Attitudes and values were just as much matters for attention and these upheld liberal and conservative positions, though similar approaches were also taken towards provision for sport by the Labour Party.

Leading figures of the Labour Party and Trade Union movement had connections with the Workers Sports Association established in 1930, including Clement Attlee, Arthur Henderson, Ernest Bevin, Herbert Morrison, Philip Noel-Baker and Sir Stafford Cripps (54). Though they

were largely figureheads, Attlee and Henderson in particular spoke of the necessity for a virile sports organisation as an integral part of the Labour Movement (55). Herbert Morrison was a member of the Central Council of Recreative Physical Training when it was formed in 1935 (56) and Philip Noel-Baker was a member of the National Fitness Council when set up in 1937 (57). But far from questioning the direction of sport in British society - which the more radical Communist Party based Workers Sports Federation had done in the 1930s, at least in its official journal and through attempts to put pressure on local authorities in London over the provision of facilities and freedom to play on Sundays (58) - the official Sports organisation of the Labour movement tended to concern itself with increasing provision and opportunity for sports competition for its members as a means of making union membership more attractive. Individually, Labour M.P.s like Herbert Morrison and Philip Noel-Baker lent their support to the main national thrust for sport and physical recreation so that in several respects the objectives of Labour fitted in with the state's scheme for recreation for the masses; its understanding of the role sport should play in society showed similarities with the national central co-ordinating body conception as exemplified in the advancement of the C.C.R.P.T.

In returning to the question, therefore, of how far recreative physical training legitimised liberal capitalism in the 1930s it can be said that a good deal of publicity was achieved with the purpose of persuading the population that something was being done for them. Government statements and plans of the voluntary agencies for provision of facilities and the organisation of training courses were reported by the press. Capital grants were made to local authorities and voluntary bodies to the value of approximately £1½ million involving 304 projects throughout the country. These ranged from Swimming Baths, Clubs, Village

Halls, other Social and Recreative, Gymnasias, Youth Hostels, Camps and Camping Sites, Equipment and Playing Fields (59). Notwithstanding the assessments of writers of the time that the young did not seem to desire fitness, there was a fair amount of promotion and activity about the subject. However, the Government action came late in the 1930s and the extent to which this achieved the claims and objectives for mental and moral development is questionable.

The second aspect of political and ideological significance relates to the changing power relations of the occupational groups concerned with post-school physical recreation. A key institution for the focus of analysis is the newly established voluntary national co-ordinating body in the field in the 1930s, the Central Council of Recreative Physical Training. Important factors for gaining occupational status for emerging institutions like the Central Council of Recreative Physical Training included, firstly, the particular role and claim to expertise it could construct, and secondly the relationship it might be able to secure with individual politicians and establishment figures and with state departments and local authorities. The C.C.R.P.T. had an almost immediate impact on the other agencies in sport, recreation and physical education when it was established in 1935, since from its inauguration it assumed the role of the national co-ordinating body both in definition and approach, and was intent on establishing its position vis-à-vis other voluntary agencies, such as the National Playing Fields Association, as the leading national authority for post-school physical recreation. It asserted as much drawing attention to the official acknowledgement of its expertise in its Second News Leaflet in 1936 stating that,

it has been fortunate in being recognised by the Board of Education as the national co-ordinating body best capable of furthering on a co-operative basis the physical recreation of those of post-school age (60).

Further consolidation of its status was developed both at an ideological level and in practical attempts to define the roles of other groups. The distinctive nature of the C.C.R.P.T. was its identification with and commitment to 'training'. The organisation itself owed its existence to the initiative and support of the Ling Association of Teachers of Swedish Gymnastics and the National Association of Organisers of Physical Education (61). Its philosophical roots were in the pedagogy of physical education, and its full-time staff were mainly appointed from trained teachers. Physical Training Colleges were also seen as one of the best sources of potential leaders of recreative work (62). Furthermore, it was physical educationists and the recreation, keep fit and youth groups which led the way in the formation of the C.C.R.P.T. rather than the larger governing bodies of sport who joined, according to a key founder member of the C.C.R.P.T., because they may have felt they would be missing out on something (63). There were also connections with 'health'. The C.C.R.P.T. argued in its News Leaflet in 1937,

In order that the present "drive" may bring about lasting progress, physical training must not be pigeon-holed and treated as a separate entity; it must be linked up with other pursuits and developed in proper conjunction with all general factors, such as nutrition and hygiene, which can assist in the improvement and maintenance of the best possible development and functioning of the body, thereby aiding growth of character (64).

Here links are made with training, hygiene and character development. Although the claims for character training appear to be exaggerated and rhetorical, and the comments on nutrition and hygiene are fairly bland, association of physical training with health and moral purpose was consistently stated by the C.C.R.P.T. in its aims and purposes. There was also a marked influence of the Minister for Health and the British Medical Association in debates on physical recreative training in the 1930s. Coupled with this was the need of the C.C.R.P.T. to

demonstrate a wider relevance and instrumental purpose than the teaching of physical training. The inclusion of 'health' along with 'training' were thus dominant ideological thrusts in the expanding influence of the C.C.R.P.T., and these became more prominent in national priorities than the specific and separate skills orientation of the various governing bodies of sport.

A notable characteristic of the C.C.R.P.T. in its early years was its attempt to establish its identity and to mark out the boundaries of its role and relationship to other bodies. One of the ways it did this was to categorise the national organisations which had become members of the Council. Governing bodies of sport, for example, comprised a section who were seen to be dealing solely with Physical Training. Sport (including Athletics, Boxing, Camping, Cricket, Football, etc.) was therefore in this context defined as physical training. The category Recreation Physical Training, on the other hand, was applied to a wide range of youth organisations and voluntary clubs and associations (65). All these bodies still retained their own identity, and it was stated by the C.C.R.P.T. that the Council could not supplant or supercede them. Nevertheless, the Council argued that co-ordination of effort meant strength to all; and in this enterprise of making the lobby for physical recreation and training a more powerful force the C.C.R.P.T. played a leading role. The Council similarly spelt out its own special position, experience and privilege of wide contacts in relation to physical education in schools, pointing out that:

Recreative physical training differs considerably from that taught in schools; the Council with its central position and contacts, is able to keep in touch with national and international development, and so be available to place its increasing experience at the disposal of any local authority ... The Council is

anxious to co-operate with authorities
in an advisory, or where desired, in an
executive capacity (66).

The basis of the C.C.R.P.T.'s claims for special knowledge and experience stemmed from its opportunities for contact with a range of organisations of different sports and associations, but also from connections with important people in established positions - and most notably with Ministers of State and state departments. It was through the state's interest in recreative physical training that the C.C.R.P.T. gained status in relation to other sports bodies and voluntary associations, but at the same time it lost a certain degree of independence. As H. Justin Evans points out,

in view of its dependence upon
grant aid, the C.C.P.R. (the
C.C.R.P.T. changed its title to
Central Council of Physical
Recreation in 1943) was not in the
fullest and strictest sense a
voluntary organisation after 1937 ... (67)

The General Secretary of the C.C.R.P.T. later claimed, on the other hand, that it had no vested interests and the Ministry (Board of Education until 1944) had attached few strings (68). This tends to confirm the facilitative role of the state with regard to recreation. However, it is necessary to contrast Phyllis Colson's comments with the position of the C.C.P.R. as a national co-ordinating body relative to other organisations. It may have been concerned to assist other governing bodies and associations, but in this very act of providing a service it was also placing itself in a position of importance vis-à-vis these organisations. The professional ethic of altruism has to be interpreted not just in the surface appearance, but in the deeper social significance of providing a service with claims of expertise.

The extent of the prestige and influence of the C.C.R.P.T. was put to the test between 1937 and 1939 when the grant-awarding body established by the Government - the National Advisory (Fitness) Council - attempted, though without success, to incorporate the C.C.R.P.T. During the autumn of 1937 three meetings took place between the two organisations, and it was later minuted that prior to the first meeting it had become known that the officers of the National Advisory Council desired the fusion of the two organisations or alternatively, that the Central Council should retain its name and identity, but should undertake only such defined branches of the technical work as, from time to time were specified by the National Advisory Council (69). This was resisted by the C.C.R.P.T., which at a joint meeting on 23rd November, 1937, made a case for retaining its promotional functions (70). The C.C.R.P.T.'s case was finally accepted by the National Advisory council.

Evans (71) puts forward a number of criticisms of the National Fitness Council stressing that it established an area bureaucracy of its own which local authorities felt duplicated their own organisation, and that it failed to involve appropriate bodies and individuals from sport and recreation in their activities. Its emphasis on health and social welfare rather than physical training and recreation may also have led to less support from those organisations concerned with physical recreation (72). However, what the conflict seems to reveal is the strength of the old guard - the establishment - in the form of the experienced and titled personnel comprising the General purposes sub-Committee of the C.C.R.P.T. - Lord Hampden, Sir Percival Sharp, Sir John Catlow, S.F. Rous (later Sir Stanley Rous), under the Presidency of Lord Astor and with patronage of the King and Queen. They managed to maintain the existence and relative independence of the C.C.R.P.T. against the forces of the state agency. In effect, the C.C.R.P.T. as the new professionals of physical recreation had formed a three-way link:

between the grass roots of popular sport and recreation, upper-class sports patrons, and the state - via the Board of Education. The Board of Education's machinery (the National Fitness Council) for the development of physical recreative training may have had a broader concept than sport and recreation, yet, paradoxically, the physical recreation lobby was able to appeal to a wider body of support than the constructed government funding apparatus and in the process provide a measure of ideological and practical assistance for the Government's social and health objectives. In the event it was the National Advisory Council that was disbanded - and its records destroyed - at the outbreak of War in 1939. The C.C.R.P.T had also been told by the Board of Education to close down, but, following protest, was given reprieve in order to work mainly for the 14-20 age group in preparation for Fitness for Service during the war period (73). From a good deal of the evidence it does seem that the influential contacts made by the C.C.R.P.T. were an important factor in its development, survival and expansion. However, to remain at this instrumental notion of power is insufficient. It was surely not only the influence of *important individuals which brought about its achievements*, but the nature of what it stood for ideologically and the relevance of this at a particular moment of history. A more structural interpretation emphasises this ideological significance and its relation to the political decision-making as having a connection with economic requirements of the system of society. It is argued that recreative physical training was a movement which was significant not just for physical fitness and health, but for the part it could play in providing legitimacy support for the prevailing dominance of liberal values in the 1930s. The fact that it was able to attract support from distinguished members of the establishment and state interest is linked to the significance of physical recreation for its legitimating purposes. Yet at the same time it was these members who were able to present a case for the survival of the C.C.R.P.T in terms which were appropriate for national needs defined by

that establishment. In this respect the C.C.R.P.T. was clearly an establishment and middle class body which played a part in helping maintain the liberal capitalist state.

Youth, Citizenship and Commerce

The years 1939-1960 cover two distinctive periods: the Second World War (1939-1945), and the post-war era (1945-1960). The first was dominated by the national effort for military victory, and the second by attempts to recover from the obvious disturbances and privations of the impact of war on economic and social life. The place of sport and organised physical activities in these periods was very much affected by these conditions. Clearly, normal arrangements for the provision of recreation were curtailed in the war years, and a resurgence of interest was evident in the years after 1945. However, there was a significant common focus for both periods which related to recreation, and that concerned the interest in the young - mainly working class males - displayed by the state and professional bodies. By the 1950s the market potential of young people's leisure interests was also attracting commerce on an increasing scale. In addition, the more prominent position of youth in the changing economic and social conditions of the time had an important connection with the competing ideologies of liberal humanism and commercialism. The liberal ideology was evident in the ideas of 'service' and 'citizenship' which characterised the policies of statutory and voluntary organisations in the provision of physical recreation. The commercial ideology was conspicuous in the exploitation of the liberation of youth from traditional adult styles of consumption. These two ideological forces were in tension, particularly in the 1950s when the entire commercialised youth culture came to be defined as 'a problem' by establishment organisations including the sports and recreation providers. This focus on youth in the 1939-60 period underlines a further significant

aspect of the provision of physical recreation - that is, the tendency for concentration on the working class young male, thus perpetuating class and gender differences.

A notable feature of the 1939-1945 war period was that although resources were massively directed to the war effort there was also, from the start, in the sphere of physical recreation, as in education generally, a concern with the new post-war society - and with debate and political action over the shape of institutions which might provide a better deal than the poverty, unemployment and strife of the 1920s and 1930s. Historically, militarism has had strong connections with physical training and because of its value to society in providing a fit fighting force physical training has received state support on different occasions in Britain (74). The immediate purpose of preparation for the war was clearly one reason for maintaining a system of post-school physical education, but the reconstruction for the post-war period was also a consideration. With regard to the latter, the years 1939-1945 were significant for two developments: one, the further efforts of the state in developing provision for youth, and two, the growth of the central voluntary organisations of physical recreative training. The two were connected, both as a means of integrating society and of controlling working class elements - of providing opportunities for all youth, but of bringing certain sections under the influence of formally organised clubs and associations.

The Government, through the Board of Education, led the way in announcing the formation of a Directorate of Physical Recreation in the House of Commons on 22nd August, 1940 (75). This was in essence a continuation of the policies spelt out in the 1937 Physical Recreation and Training Act, the stated objective being to build upon the systematic physical training given in schools and to give young people in the 14-20

age group, who had ceased full-time attendance at school, wider opportunities to take part in physical recreation (76). The extent of the Government's interest in youth is indicated by the arrangements which were made with the War Office for the gradual release, so far as military requirements allowed, of qualified and experienced organisers and leaders so that they could be available to help in the organisation of recreative physical training in connection with the Service of Youth (77). Further analysis of the significance of this scheme will be made following some comment on the administrative arrangements made to involve the C.C.R.P.T.

Allowing the not very popular or successful National Fitness Council to wither did not mean the end of the state's interest in physical recreation. Indeed, the administrative device of a small Directorate gave the Board of Education greater control than having a fully-blown Council. In addition, the Board had come to realise the value of working more through those voluntary organisations like the Central Council which had developed contacts and support from a wide range of sports and with a variety of social groups (78). Furthermore, a very close alliance was forged with the Central Council by arranging for their General Secretary, Miss P.C. Colson, to work on a part-time secondment basis for the Directorate of Physical Recreation (79). Justin Evans dismisses any sinister meaning which might be construed about the Directorate of Recreation, stating that it was a convenient measure for rapid decisions in a time of war without reference back to committees. This may well be the case. He does, nevertheless, indicate that in addition to immediate tasks its terms of reference were later enlarged to include 'building for the future by taking action which will assist with post-war reconstruction' (80). In that respect it had an important advisory task. But the main point to make is that this arrangement provides further evidence of the dominance of the politics of influence in British sport and recreation - with the voluntary organisation, the C.C.R.P.T., closely

involved with State Department, implementing government policies and receiving benefits accordingly (81). The most critical representative element of popular sport was within certain branches and activities of the Communist Party supported Workers Sports Federation, but any influence it had - and this is minimised by one of its more active Regional Secretaries (82) - petered out during the war when people were in the armed services, and it never revived afterwards. In social class terms this leadership from above can be seen as part of a wider strategy to win consensus for a new deal after the war. As far as the voluntary movement was concerned this did not particularly mean a socialist society, but rather an opportunity to extend further the growth of sport and recreation with improved facilities, more activity and higher standards of performance. In the sense that these objectives also fitted into the popular demands for improved welfare after the poverty, unemployment and limited amenities of the 1930s and 1940s, then the possibilities of a Labour government which aimed to increase public spending on such provisions may not have been unwelcome.

However, with regard to the particular focus on the youth sector this was seen by the Board of Education as a problem area where guidance and control was necessary to channel the young into some ideal set of attitudes and forms of behaviour. On the one hand, there was a popular demand for a more just and egalitarian society as expressed by the election of a Labour Government in 1945 with a programme setting out to overcome class barriers; yet on the other, the establishment in sport and recreation appeared to comply with a policy which saw working class youth in particular as in need of strong controls. This was not essentially a new phenomenon, but rather a continuation of the 'rational recreation' theme in which the youth movements and clubs - often attached to churches or Sunday schools - were run by middle class adults for the less respectable working class male youths, which Roberts describes as those

'in need', or who were 'at risk' from families that lacked the material resources or moral character to keep their own out of trouble (83). What was new was the potential for some increase in state resources to assist in providing for youth compared with the restraint on public spending throughout the inter-war period. From 1921 local authorities were permitted though not required to establish their own clubs or to support voluntary bodies. Nationwide public provision was not instituted until the outbreak of war in 1939 when the welfare of the entire 14-20 age group was made a Local Education Authority responsibility, and this position was confirmed in the 1944 Education Act.

Sport and recreation were very much part of this overall strategy of engaging youth in organised and controlled leisure activities. The importance of the development of a wide variety of recreative interests was stressed by the Board of Education in its Memorandum on the Youth Service Corps which it generated in various parts of the country in 1940 (84). It claimed that such interests helped to maintain the 'holding power' of the squads and to develop the social sense and that the eagerness of young people at that time offered an opportunity that should not be missed. Suggestion, encouragement and some guidance were encouraged to bring into practical activity a good will and readiness for service hitherto not developed. Central government thus continued to appear concerned to influence the behaviour and attitudes of the young, and in the general emotional response to war they saw the means of sustaining a set of values which stressed 'responsibility', 'service' and 'duty' in the cause of community and nation - of fitting in and contributing to the existing society of Britain at war; but also of trying to maintain a conflict-free country of consensus politics after the war. Recreation was perceived by the Board of Education to have a useful function in this overall objective: of providing the discipline of physical activity, but also attracting new members to the various youth clubs and groups whose underlying rationale was 'service' (85).

The Youth Service Corps Units throughout the country certainly used physical recreation and/or more formal physical training - though in a variety of ways. Some examination of the official Board of Education report (86) will provide at least an insight into the way in which physical activity was understood and presented, though with limitations of not revealing what actually took place. The following examples of specific Corps Units were selected by the Board of Education to illustrate the adaptability of the idea of a Youth Service Corps in both rural and urban conditions.

There was no attempt to present a stereotype model, but rather to allow local sentiment and local needs to influence the development of particular units. However, the way in which these organisations were developed seems to reflect social class differences, and the ideological significance of an emphasis on 'recreation' and 'service' appears to be to displace the class character of youth groups. *East Suffolk Youth Service* Corps unit reported that:

one interesting feature is their development of recreational interests. Each squad in its own way is becoming a social, education and recreation unit. The large majority of members have joined the local evening institutes, while some squads have formed drama, first aid and dancing classes.

The Liverpool Civil Defence Cadets was formed to appeal to those boys who had been unattached to the existing youth organisations. Here members were told that they would be unfit for A.R.P. work unless they were a 'disciplined body' and 'fit in body', and that drill and physical training would therefore be an integral part of their training. Each two-hour parade was divided into: First Aid, Fire fighting and Anti-Gas Training - 1 hour; Physical Training - ½ hour; Drill - ½ hour.

The Bradford scheme similarly attempted to appeal to the tough guy who had hitherto been unaffected by existing youth organisations. The idea of bodily fitness was also seen as an integral feature of the scheme. On enrolment every recruit had to give an undertaking to (a) attend at least one practice weekly in the subject chosen, e.g. A.R.P., First Aid, Fire Fighting, etc; (b) attend a physical training class; (c) take the periodic proficiency tests in the subject chosen.

In Hertfordshire, however, the squads chose their own work in their own locality and determined their own form of administration. Their report stated that:

it is interesting to note that some squads are developing social activities, although the main part of the programme of every squad is carrying out jobs of national importance.

What is noticeable from these accounts is the difference in approach from the urban and rural areas, the former rather authoritarian and concerned with using physical activities for difficult working class youth, the latter more open and offering a broader choice of cultural and artistic pursuits. However, the extent to which they internalised the social objectives of citizenship underlying the promotion of such schemes is questionable. Nevertheless, the extracts from the reports above do indicate the way that physical activities were presented varied according to social class - compulsory drill and formal physical training for working class city youths and freely chosen pursuits for middle class clients.

In summary, the key to understanding the relationship between the state and physical recreation during the 1939-45 war period lies in recognising the political character of the plans for the reconstruction of

post-war society. This can be identified as a tension between conservative/liberal and socialist forces. On the other hand there was concern by government to maintain an ordered society in which traditional values of service, responsibility and duty were upheld particularly among working class youth. On the other hand a popular movement for radical change was evident which stressed economic stability, full employment and equal opportunity. Indeed the crisis of the war has been assessed as a crucial transformative time acting as a springboard for the welfare state developments of the post-1945 phase of British capitalism (87). The Labour Government of 1945-51 actually incorporated the objectives of greater opportunity within a programme of nationalisation of industry and social ownership, but at the same time attempted through education and youth service policies focused around notions of citizenship to reduce political and social conflicts on the basis of a common stake in the system, thus maintaining fundamental inequalities. The national co-ordinating voluntary body the C.C.R.P.T. with its strengthened alliance with the Board of Education during the war period tended to provide support for the conservative and liberal forces. Through the encouragement of attitudes amongst young people of 'service', 'responsibility', and 'mental' as well as 'physical' health it served to lend assistance both to the war effort and for a post-war society of social order as much as social change.

Although, as McIntosh (1968) points out, the health and therapeutic element in schools physical education was reduced through revised administrative arrangements in the 1944 Education Act which severed official links between physical education inspectors and the Chief Medical Officer of the near Ministry of Education (88), and the C.C.R.P.T. dropped the 'training' aspect from its title, signalling a shift to the development of wider sport and recreation interests among the public, nevertheless, the concern of education and recreation authorities with the

cultural activities of youth as a form of socialisation continued in the post-war period. Indeed the economic and social changes of the 1950s and 1960s intensified official interest in the question of youth.

Initially, in the early post-war years the theme of citizenship was developed as an extension of the earlier programme and based on the same pre-war assumptions about the place of the young in the economic and social structure - that is where teenage labour was cheap, earned relatively low wages, whose reference point generally was the adult society, but where controls were seen to be required for the less well socialised. However, as Roberts (1983) points out, with the achievement of full employment in the 1950s the mainly working class school leavers benefited from the increased wages which were forced on employers needing to compete for labour in a shortage market (89). The notion that Britain became an 'affluent society' at this time contained its own ideological purpose and cannot be accepted uncritically. I shall return to this point later in the discussion. Nevertheless, the relative greater economic independence of youth had consequences for its capacity as a consumer, and for its relationship to adult society. It also made the traditional statutory and voluntary Youth Service even less effective as a means of socialising the 14-20 age group.

As already indicated, the ideology of citizenship was essentially used to displace the class character of the inter-war period and the domestic politics of the war itself. The new Ministry of Education of a Labour Government (1946-1951) also developed a campaign on the subject appealing in their pamphlet 'Citizens Growing Up' (90) to 'all who are interested in helping young people to become decent members of society'. They argued that recreations, hobbies and pleasures have a great deal to do with the creation of opinion; that voluntary, local and private institutions should be the focus of attention in developing a spirit of

service, respect for others views and property, and a sense of gratitude. It thus looked on citizenship as something wider than the question of political rights and obligations, in the sense of accentuating the private and personal lives of people as an area in which ideological values can be formed. With regard to leisure and physical recreation, the desired forms of pursuit are quite evident. The good citizen is seen as one who engages in club-based activities usually connected with organised outdoor and countryside pursuits, whilst the masses who spend their time in watching films, going to dog racing and public dance halls are regarded as in deficit (91). There is thus a moral authoritarian stance taken about the proper use of leisure time.

However, this liberal progressive ideology which dominated the ethic of the Youth Service came under question in the 1950s not so much from the established order - the Ministry of Education or voluntary bodies - but from working class teenagers under the influence of the counter ideology of commercial interests. The relative increased spending power of working class teenagers during the post-war boom provided a market which the music and fashion industries exploited. It was commercial rather than state provided recreation that attracted young people entering employment. And although youth clubs had never appealed to many working class youth, the association of commercial leisure with delinquency highlighted by the media produced some concern amongst the establishment. Researchers and government committees (Crowther 1959, Albermarle 1960) expressed their disquiet about how young people's leisure was becoming more independent and less controlled. In this respect commercialism represented a threat to moral standards enshrined within the liberal values of the Youth Service. At the same time the ideology of economic growth dominated political policies and was reflected in the expansion of the voluntary movement of physical recreation. Evans (1974) records that the period 1951-60 was one of immense activity for the C.C.R.P.T. with

constant growth and an unending battle to secure the finance necessary to carry out its ambitious plans (92). But this growth in public provision had to contend with commercial interest in the youth market. These responses to the trends of economic expansion - of the growth of facilities and commodities and the contrasting interests and concerns of leisure industries, youth groups and establishment bodies - are analysed further in the following paragraphs. At a party political level the 1950s are noted for their high degree of consensus. The Conservatives - in power from 1951-1964 - as well as accepting the run-down of the empire became attuned to the material demands of a mass electorate (demands that business was creating and they were quick to exploit) in order to retain power, whilst the Labour Party dominated by a revisionist grouping from within saw growth as offering advancement to the working class without having to do battle with capitalism (93). Yet the involvement of a middle class youth in the Campaign for Nuclear disarmament and the phenomenon of the working-class Teddy Boy with Edwardian style dress and publicised acts of violence expressed their alienation from the meritocratic goals of the apparent affluent society (94). A gap was revealed between the liberal ideals of citizenship and community service and the reality of working class adolescents disassociation from the system of leisure, as well as school and work. It had been said that 'the arrival of youth on the political stage marked the beginning of the end of consensus' (95). The response of sport and recreation to the changes of the 1950s needs to be seen against this background. Clearly the sports establishment was concerned about youth as its most ready-made client. After all the main attention of the National Fitness Council and C.C.R.P.T. was given to the younger age group.

The traditional approach of central policy making has tended to assume the impartiality of the state with an inclination to identify social problems either as problems of deviance or as problems of social

disorganisation (96). Following this pattern, the response by the sports establishment to the well publicised youth activities of the 1950s was to press for the improvement of national voluntary youth organisations as a means of preventing the young from falling into evil ways. The 1957/1958 annual report of the Central Council of Physical Recreation argued that,

the nation's interests demand that young workers should be encouraged to take part in physical activities ... Young people need fun, and an outlet for their mental and physical energies, their sense of adventure, their urge to achieve and their wish to belong to a community - a 'gang'. Physical pursuits are one means of meeting their needs - needs which, if unsatisfied, too often find destructive outlets (97).

Whilst this statement shows a recognition that physical pursuits are only one dimension of cultural interests, it nevertheless implies that the solution to deviant behaviour lies in the provision of organised opportunities. The C.C.P.R. appear here to be responding opportunistically to the wave of media attention directed towards the Teddy boy movement in the period 1954-1957, where the word 'gang' was used pejoratively by the press to depict the gang fights involving young working class groups who dressed in Edwardian style clothes. Although there was no doubt that Teddy Boys were violent and did present a problem for social order, the C.C.P.R. seemed to be rationalising the 'moral panic' of the time in two ways: firstly, by treating young people as a homogeneous group with basic general needs; and secondly, by identifying the problem as a lack of opportunity for the young to release their physical energies in socially acceptable pursuits. But as Paul Rock and Stanley Cohen (1970), John Clarke (1979) and Dick Hebdige (1981) all argue, youth in general or working class youth should not be seen as a simple unity brought about by increased affluence, but - in Clarke's words - as a 'complex, uneven and contradictory ensemble' (98). Furthermore,

the problem should be located in the social structure rather than on an individual basis of psychological drive or surplus energy. There was a tendency for national organisations like the C.C.P.R. to conceive of young people's needs in middle class terms, and to assume they applied to all young people. But in Rock and Cohen's explanation these values of self-improvement and club affiliation were rejected by many working class adolescents. Both the conventional Youth Service and the commercial entertainment of that time were considered to offer little opportunity for satisfaction, and in addition, the branding of Teddy Boys in particular as 'folk devils' denied them even of access to legitimate pleasures which were accessible to them (99).

The realisation by national organisations of the ineffectiveness of traditional approaches in addressing the so-called problem of youth was seen as a deficiency of organisation and finance, rather than as an expression of social class inequalities. Criticism was directed by a number of interest groups at the level of organisation of the Youth Service. The publication by King George's Jubilee Trust, 'Citizens of Tomorrow', (100) argued strongly for a substantial increase in government funds for the youth service and was critical of the Ministry of Education's policy on youth. This kind of criticism led to the setting up of a Select Committee in 1956-1957 which reported that:

the impression gained from the inquiry is that the Ministry is little interested in the present state of the youth service and apathetic about its future (101).

Such pressure seems to have contributed to the institution of the Albemarle Committee which enquired into the Youth Service (102). But the Albemarle Committee Report itself really underlined the concern of authority with so-called delinquent youth and the objective of turning the

teenager into the responsible adult citizen. The value of physical activities and particularly residential and venture courses was stressed in discipline terms as well as providing new opportunities, seeing them as a replacement of the benefits of national service which took young men away from home and, it argued, 'subjected them to many vigorous and some fascinating pursuits under discipline' (103). Albemarle indeed concentrated on obtaining expansion of training facilities, a new salary structure for youth leaders, building programmes and the establishment of a development council (104); but did not rigorously address the factors which alienated those not attracted to the Youth Service - instead it provided more of the same thing.

The ideology of citizenship, though promoted by government departments and established authorities was therefore by no means easily implanted in a way which its proponents desired, for the very forces of capitalist accumulation in the boom period of post-war expansion operated simultaneously as a counter-vailing tendency. *The consolidation of a consumer society* involved the growth of a mass market in leisure goods and services which appealed to the young (105) as well as the provision of basic requirements of housing, health services and education sought by the population at large (106). The leisure market was not concerned with standards of behaviour or values of responsibility, but rather with increasing the number of consumers of its products and thereby of profits. Affluence as an ideology was promoted by the Conservative Party as a means of appealing to the mass electorate, and by the Labour Party as a way of material advancement for the working class. Sport and recreation were deeply entwined in the ideological tensions between citizenship and affluence, of liberalism and commercialism. While being used as a tool for shaping the defined deviant behaviour of youth it was itself influenced by the consumer society phase of capitalism. But it seems that the policies of voluntary bodies like the C.C.P.R. and the Ministry of

Education by-passed and failed to understand the needs of sections of working class youth. Indeed, they actually reinforced their disadvantages. As Hall et al. (1976) point out:

... the ideology of affluence reconstructed the 'real relations' of post-war British society into an 'imaginary relation' ... Affluence was essentially an ideology of the dominant culture about and for the working class ... Few working class people subscribed to a version of their own situation which so little squared with its real dimensions. What mattered, therefore, was not the passive remaking of the working class in the affluent image but the dislocations it produced - and the responses it provoked (107).

Cultural Studies contributors in the 1970s have decoded these dislocations and responses indicating for instance, that the Teddy boy culture was an expression of the reality and aspirations of the group. Their behaviour conveyed attempts to retain, if only imaginatively, a hold on territory which was being expropriated from them in housing redevelopment, and to buy status by adopting Edwardian dress, traditionally worn by aristocratic young men (108). The state and voluntary bodies as part of the established dominant culture actively contributed to the labelling of these working class 'gangs', accentuating the difficulties for them in gaining access to facilities. They also bear some responsibility for the chronic lack of public provision of appropriate facilities to match the increase in adolescent leisure, expecting too much from what was provided (109). The public reaction to the disorders surrounding youth groups was opportunistically capitalised on in the 1950s by the sport and recreation organisations in developing a case for the expansion of resources, facilities and improved administrative machinery. However, the structural realities of working class groups seemed to be consistently ignored and/or misunderstood in the developments of providing material resources for recreation in the following decades, but this can also be explained structurally - as a continuation of class hegemony.

Physical Education and Competition

Just as trained teachers of physical education were instrumental in initiating a campaign in the 1930s to establish a national co-ordinating body for physical recreative training, so in the post-war period physical educationists had an influence in developments which gave a greater emphasis to competitive sport and which assisted in moves towards the recommendations for a Sports Development Council. Indeed, physical education in the teaching training establishments played an important ideological role with regard to the strengthening of links between post-school sport and physical recreation on the one hand, and competitive sport on the other, and in shifting the definition of the subject away from health and towards competition. One effect of this for the 1960s was to provide a ready market - albeit perhaps unintentionally - for politicians to use to advantage, and for business and media interests to commercially exploit.

Physical Education theory in the 1950s was oriented towards the physiology of exercise or the mechanics of skill, and as such was, by implication, uncritical of wider social aspects and aligned itself with the status quo. The dominant economic ideology of the 1950s and early 1960s was constructed around the aims of enhancing Britain's performance in the international market. The general increase in living standards was emphasised by the Conservative Government both as an economic and political objective, and, through the description of Britain as an affluent society, as an ideological strategy to maintain power. Policy reports in education were shaped within this dominant framework. The Crowther Report (1959) on the '15 to 18 Age Group' in particular emphasised the importance of maintaining national standards for material and moral improvements. The goals of education were defined in skill oriented and meritocratic terms in the context of preparation for an

increasingly technological society. Physical education as a school subject was part of this broader educational thrust and the emphasis by the institutions training teachers of physical education on 'skill', 'competition' and 'achievement' both reflected and reinforced technical and meritocratic values.

It was in the post-war period that the two leading institutions for the training of male physical educationists - Carnegie College, Leeds and Loughborough College - began to exert an influence on the development of physical education in schools and in the administration of sport for the wider community (110). It was also at this time that Governing bodies of sport appointed national coaches to develop schemes for the improvement of performance at a range of competitive levels (111). There was a close relationship between the two developments. A number of the new national coaches had been trained as physical educationists, and much of their work was in providing further training in coaching skills for students and teachers. This process was not just relevant in technical terms, but also had an ideological significance in defining the major focus of the subject of physical education and the post-school area of physical recreation as based on 'skill' and 'competition'. A closer identification of the subject was thus developed with sport which challenged the medical and therapeutic dominance and the long-standing preponderance of women's training institutions. There was a further important development at the end of the war brought about by the 1944 Education Act's requirement of local education authorities to provide for in-school recreational activities and the development and expansion of youth services. As Coalter (1986) points out,

this served to draw a distinction between the organisation of sport and the youth services and to reduce the quasi-governmental role of the C.C.P.R. As a result the C.C.P.R. with its coaching and promotional expertise became a forum for organised sporting interests (112).

The ideological underpinning with the establishment of physical education at Loughborough in 1937 was sporting success and achievement - fitness to some extent. Health and movement objectives tended to be given less emphasis (113). At Carnegie, too, from 1933, although gymnastics was featured, the leaning was more towards its functional and sporting uses, and games, athletics and swimming were the other major areas of the programme (114). Like Dartford Training College (for Women), thirty to forty years earlier, the products of Loughborough and Carnegie became the leading exponents in the theory and practice of physical education - for men. A collegiate system of professional leadership thus prevailed within a state system of education, which grew with the demand for teachers and specialist training. By 1955, at its 21st celebrations, Carnegie College was able to claim that of the men trained, about 40 per cent had taken up appointments in responsible positions (115). These included a large percentage of the men inspectors of schools at the Ministry of Education, a majority of the physical education appointments in universities in Britain and about 70 per cent of the training college appointments. Both colleges aimed to prepare men for positions in a broad range of posts, not just confining themselves to schools. Carnegie students filled technical posts with the Central Council of Physical Recreation and with bodies such as the Amateur Athletics Association and the Football Association (116). Loughborough was concerned to train coaches, teachers and club leaders for all branches of athletic activities (117). The tendency for information or discussion on physical education in the 1950s to focus on a concern with sporting ability is demonstrated by a selection of the rhetoric of publicity statements.

For instance, The Yorkshire Post in April, 1955 stated,

... Many people will know of
Carnegie College because of its
sports teams and the personalities

in Rugby, Soccer, Athletics and other games who have passed through the College (118).

and Loughborough College in 1952 asserted that:

... Wherever students of the College have gone they have raised the standard of the work and in many instances, have brought about an increased interest, an altogether different outlook on sport and produced some surprisingly fine improvements in performance (119).

Two major themes are common to the history of both institutions: one, the relationship and response to the state's expressed needs in time of war and peace (120); and two, the use of sport and recreation in building a corporate spirit (121). But in addition, the spread of technical information through governing bodies of sport - particularly through Summer Schools and special courses - helped to broaden the influence of these colleges nationally. Indeed, in the period from 1937 (and the Physical Training and Recreation Act) to 1956 (and the Birmingham University Britain in the World of Sport document) the men's training establishments had provided the basis for a sports-dominated physical education profession whose influence moved beyond schools to the sports bodies, and was a significant factor in the pressure for advancement of sport through state support. The Birmingham University report stated that:

where participation is concerned the dominant factors have been the progressive outlook in physical education at schools and universities and the efforts of such bodies as the Central Council of Physical Recreation (122).

The evidence indicates that they certainly made an impact. The majority of the Birmingham University Physical Education staff were

themselves the products of Loughborough and Carnegie. However, such statements were to a large extent an expression of subject imperialism. The main thrust of the late 1950s, in physical education and recreation, moved beyond only the training of sports coaches and teachers. This still continued, and was important to the building of a professional base for the selling of sport in schools and communities; but the Birmingham University Group and C.C.P.R. were concerned about more political issues - of gaining increased financial backing for sport and of seeking a liaison of sporting bodies to shape its development. In short, of gaining greater power and control over the direction of sport and physical education.

The initiative of the Birmingham University physical education staff expressed in the document Britain in the World of Sport (1956), has to be seen as a political movement to bring sport on the national agenda with the purpose of gaining increased funding and prestige for the sports fraternity - of bringing pressure on the state for material backing, but without losing autonomy and control of sport to a government department. It also attempted to gain ideological support for a serious and skill-oriented approach to sport with a concern for standards and improvements whilst at the same time upholding some of the so-called amateur values of 'fair play' and the game being more important than the result. In addition it made a case for the spread of coaching to be closely linked to the physical education profession - epitomising a liberal humanist ideology as indicated in Chapter One - and cautioned against the takeover of physical education by big-time sport as in America.

A range of problems surrounding the organisation, finance and goals of sport are posed in the Birmingham University report. These include the separate and voluntary organisation of different sports, the poverty stricken nature of many sports, the collection of money by government

through purchase tax on sports equipment and tax on football pools, the lack of government financial support compared to other countries, the lack of a specialist training and professional body for coaches, the lack of indoor facilities; and the need to address the question of success and national prestige. The solution is presented as a choice between two alternatives: one, where sports bodies organise themselves 'from below' - through their own initiatives; or two, where an energetic pressure group might persuade one or other political party to control sport either through an existing Ministry or a new one (123). This was in effect an attempt at setting the agenda, of trying to encourage sports bodies to take action, though the term 'from below' hardly meant a wide public debate from sports practitioners and athletes. Account has to be taken of the fact that the Director of Physical Education of the Department producing the report, A.D. Munrow (124), was himself a member of the executive of the C.C.P.R. and would have been sensitive to the ambitions of central figures in sport at national level. The key passage in the Birmingham University Report was the plea that

we hope most earnestly that someone
or some group will take the initiative
and invite all sports organisations to
take part in deliberations designed to
establish a sports advisory or
governing council (125).

The C.C.P.R. itself followed up the report by setting up a national enquiry into sport with the formation of the Wolfenden Committee in 1957. The urgency which the enquiry was set up indicates that it was a top-down approach rather than a popular movement from sports players. It was, by the close association of established national bodies, a professional initiative which did not proceed beyond that level. There is no evidence that the grass roots of sport were consulted. The document, Britain in the World of Sport would have been circulated to professional bodies working in the field and it is those that responded.

The underlying problem of sport as reflected in the sub-title of the report was one of national prestige. Concern about the relatively poor performance of Britain in international competition was highlighted and solutions to this problem were sought through recommendations relating to improved administrative and financial arrangements. The urgency of the matter was stressed. Indeed it was considered a patriotic duty to answer the questions that had been raised (126). Although assumptions of the worthwhileness of competing successfully at international level are questioned the response, implicit in the text of the Birmingham University document, tends to confirm the importance of competition and achievement at the highest level. Central funding and the expansion of coaching are advocated and an acceptance of the inevitability of the elitism of champions is recognised. At the same time there is a concern to broaden the base of participation. The importance of 'competing well' in behaviour as well as performance is emphasised, conveying the desire to produce a balanced assessment and giving a moral sense of responsibility in evaluating the future directions of sport (127). However, the impact of the document has ultimately to be 'read off' in terms of the over-riding concern, that is, the top competitor and national prestige.

In terms of a strategy of gaining support the authors of the report realised that this involved forming alliances with the state and/or business, though the precise form this should take or how it would be developed was rather vaguely conceived. Several alternatives were presented (128): firstly, the Government could allocate specific funds for sport; secondly, sports organisations might initiate a specific fund to which the wealthier games contributed more freely; or, thirdly, a special pools firm could be set up, which would require initial funds and business ability for its organisation. The report suggested that the administration of the fund would in some measure be linked to the source of the finance. The issue was defined as a choice between either a

representative sports committee with or without government representation - on the Swedish or American lines; or, a governmental or ministerial organisation on Russian lines.

The reponse to these alternatives was addressed by the Wolfenden Committee and will be taken up in the following chapter. The physical education profession had certainly played a part in defining the issues and alternative ways of advancement. The year 1956/1957 can be seen as a watershed. The training of physical education teachers, the coaching advancements of governing bodies of sport and the campaigning of the Central Council of Physical Recreation had produced more people with a knowledge of and interest in the progression of sport. At that point, following the post-war recovery there had been some increase in participation rates, facilities had been improved - though only to a limited extent, and funds for sport had increased moderately. The concern of administrators of sport now was the drive for expansion. In this context the role of the state and business was less one of intervention with a dependent sports fraternity, and more one of an engagement by sport led by sections of the physical education profession. State support and indeed business investment were not forced on sport and recreation bodies, but rather sought by the leading officials and professional spokesmen and women.

However, this does not mean that the state did not see the possibilities of using the cultural area for legitimation purposes. It is clearly evident that governments had begun to capitalise on the national and international political potential by association with sport and the mass interest it achieved. The Birmingham University document reveals the Foreign Office's use of Roger Bannister, the first man to run a mile in less than four minutes, on a diplomatic goodwill visit to the United States. On 17th May in the House of Commons, Mr. Selwyn Lloyd indicated

that the Foreign Office had approached Mr. Bannister to accept an invitation to the United States - funded by her Majesty's Government - as it was felt that nothing but good to Anglo-American relations would result (129).

In justifying the preferential treatment given to cricket vis-à-vis other professional sports in being allowed exemption from entertainments duty, R.A. Butler, when Chancellor of the Exchequer, held that it occupied a special place among sports, not only as forming a part of the English tradition, but as a common interest helping to bind together the various countries of the Commonwealth (130). In financial terms the government took a great deal of money from sporting activities but put back only a very small sum. In 1953-1954 approximate receipts on entertainments duty from football, horse racing, dog racing, speedway racing, cricket and other sports and entertainments are reported as being £4,240,000 and on pool betting duty - from football and dog racing - £29,418,410. The Exchequer also received a substantial sum from the purchase tax, which was chargeable, and from income tax on for instance professional earnings (131).

However, whilst government publicly acknowledged its supportive role in sport, it made it clear that any direct intervention in the sense of appointing a Minister of Sport was far from its thinking. Indeed the distaste for such an appointment had little support from Right or Left in politics (132). The Times (133) putting the traditional conservative view argued that:

there is already little enough
scope in an over-controlled
society for private initiative
and the full autonomy of voluntary
associations;

whilst the News Chronicle, presenting a more popular radical position, held that the solution to the anomalies, myths and hypocrisies in sport lay not with a Minister of Sport, but with public opinion and the common sense of the masses who engaged in casual recreation (134).

It was the physical education and recreation elements of sport itself which sought to extract from the state what it regarded as its dues in terms of financial backing whilst seeking to control the planning and funding of sport. The Central Council of Physical Recreation and the Birmingham University Physical Education Department in particular provided the pressure for the setting up of an enquiry - the Wolfenden Committee on Sport and the Community - to bring these aims into effect (135).

I have tried to show that the role of sport and recreation in the period 1930-1960 was closely linked to the changing economic, political and ideological aspects of British society as it moved through distinctive phases of capitalism - from deep recession and war, to recovery and the early stage of a boom. The key argument has been that culture - through organised physical activities - performed a service for the state in helping maintain the legitimisation of liberal capitalism. This was brought about by a combination of voluntary organisations and the involvement of the state. Physical education associations initiated a movement for the formation of a national voluntary co-ordinating body in 1935 - the Central Council of Recreative Physical Training, and the Board of Education established an administrative and funding apparatus in 1937 - the National Advisory (Fitness) Council. Both bodies, but particularly the C.C.R.P.T., constructed an officially approved meaning for general sports and physical activities as 'recreative physical training' which internalised and reproduced the purpose of physical pursuits in terms of predominantly

liberal progressive ideals of self-help and self-improvement, and conservative authoritarian values of self-discipline and training. The institutionalisation of these cultural activities in this way helped to give greater official status to the voluntary body, the C.C.R.P.T., and served to provide the impression that much was being done for the nation's health, fitness and moral needs. However, the movement was essentially a middle class one which concentrated mainly on coaching, training and the award of grants for clubs, school teachers, youth organisations and local authorities. The extent to which it improved the health, life style or values of working class groups is questionable.

The war-period and the later 1940s saw a continuation of the close connections between the C.C.R.P.T. and state (through the Board of Education then Ministry of Education) and the focus on provision for the 14-20 age group - particularly working class males. The emphasis was on 'service' and 'citizenship', 'responsibility' and 'duty' and indicates the continuity with the theme of *rational recreation evident in the 1930s and the 19th century*. In the context of the 1940s these values reflect a moral authoritarian stance which had a class basis in defining the desired form of leisure pursuits for the young in a planned democratically ordered society. The changing economic forces of the 1950s both emphasised the establishment nature and the ineffectiveness of the voluntary organisations in addressing the recreative needs of working class youth. In particular, the relative increased earnings of adolescents in work led to the birth of commercialised youth cultures. However, understanding of the social and political underpinnings of the violent activities and styles of dress of the Teddy Boy gangs as expressions of deeper responses to the loss of territory in the redevelopment of their inner urban communities was submerged in media reactions which labelled them as 'folk devils'. In effect, the policies and practice of recreation voluntary bodies (C.C.R.P.T.) and state (the Ministry of Education) by-passed and

failed to recognise the real needs of sections of working class youth. Indeed, they may have actually reinforced their disadvantages. At the same time there were concerns that the education and youth services were not catering for changing social and economic conditions, and it was in this context that physical education groups (particularly the Birmingham University P.E. Department with its publication, Britain in the World of Sport) and physical recreation bodies (notably the Central Council of Physical Recreation) proposed the establishment of a national committee to examine the factors affecting the development of games, sports and outdoor activities in the United Kingdom. The 1950s were also significant for the shift of emphasis in organised physical activities away from health and recreative training and towards competitive sport. This shift was linked to the developments in training establishments for men's physical education and their interest in sporting achievements, to the administrative changes which made provision for youth the responsibility of L.E.A.s - encouraging the C.C.P.R. to become more involved with sports organisations than youth associations, and to the expansion of coaching schemes with governing bodies of sport. It was also a reflection of the interests in national success and achievement in sporting events, which fitted in with the economic national recovery and development in the 1950s.

CHAPTER THREE

POLITICAL DIMENSIONS OF SPORT: THE CENTRAL STATE AND ITS AGENTS

It has been argued in the previous chapter that in the 1930s and 1940s the state through the Board of Education, then Ministry of Education, facilitated development in the recreative training aspect of post-school organised physical activities for social and political purposes. A grant-awarding body (the Fitness Council 1937-39) was formed, and close collaboration was achieved with the national voluntary co-ordinating body (the C.C.R.P.T.). In the period from the late 1950s to the mid-1980s, the involvement of the state in sport has been extended further. This was approached initially in the 1960s through introducing the post of Minister for Sport (1964) and the establishment of the Sports Council (1965). In the 1980s, direct government intervention has become more evident. In particular, there has been greater Ministerial action in social policy (earmarking specific financial assistance towards the provision of facilities in areas which were the scene of inner city riots in 1981), in international politics (attempting to influence sports bodies attendance at the 1980 Moscow Olympics) and in domestic politics (prescribing the policies of football authorities in relation to football hooliganism).

The progressively tighter control of sports policy by the state from the late 1950s to the 1980s has been achieved both through the formation and development of the quasi-national organisation of the Sports Council, and by the increasingly directive role played by Government Ministers and Departments. This chapter will focus on the political dimensions of the origins and growth of the Sports Council

and the sociological significance of this as indicative of a particular relationship between state and civil society - civil society in this context meaning the political and cultural hegemony of an elite group in sport over the sporting masses (1). It will also examine the role of government in using sport for political purposes both through the Sports Council and independently of it.

Reference to politics in association with sport provokes different responses, both from participants in that political process, and from academics interpreting the political role of sport. Three distinctive approaches can be characterised. The first takes the line that sport is above politics, that it is essentially about fun, that it can be valuable in health terms, and that it is one of the most effective ways of providing social education through participation with others in an organised game or recreation - but that fundamentally it is, or should be, autonomous, independent and neutral. The Duke of Edinburgh, President of the C.C.P.R., a leading advocate of this position, while pointing out that it was important to ensure that the views of governing bodies of sport were made known where it mattered - in Parliament, in local government, in the Sports Council, in the media and in the Ministries - has also stressed that 'sport does not exist for the political convenience of governments' (2). Walter Winterbottom, former Director of the Sports Council, also questions whether the Sports Council should be 'responsible for solving or helping to solve the social problems of our society'. 'Is this not the rightful role of government', he asks (3). These views assert the uniqueness and independence of sports bodies, yet at the same time promote its cause in the political arena, and increasingly in the period from the 1960s have staked a claim for increased resources from public funds. Sport in Britain is reified and championed, especially by governing bodies like the Rugby Football Union as above politics -

particularly with regard to government involvement - but in practice it is part of the dominant value system of capitalist society. Indeed, this view of sport as an end in itself stems from a liberal-humanist tradition which has roots in the class-based aristocratic notion of the disinterestedness of sport on the one hand and the amateur ideals akin to the public school team games and modern Olympic games on the other. There is also a sense in which sport is regarded as being above politics simply because governing bodies and athletes maintain the right to run their own affairs and to choose with whom and under what conditions they arrange events independently of governments or other powers. However, this notion of autonomy does not mean that the decisions taken by governing bodies have no ideological or political implications. The stand taken by the British Olympic Association to allow athletes to compete in the 1980 Moscow Olympics, the decision of the Rugby Football Union to tour South Africa in 1984, or the tendency for governing bodies to develop links with business interests in the 1980s are actions which represent specific values about what is socially and morally important. Far from being a-political, sport in many cases serves to maintain and promote conservative political interests.

A second approach is to see sport also as important, whether for enjoyment, health or social purposes, but to the extent that the state should take a greater interest and that the nature of this interest should depend on the value to be achieved not just for sport, but for social objectives. However, what has been apparent is the steadily increasing intervention of the state from a supportive to a directive approach. Supportive state assistance which occurred from about 1965 to 1975 tended to recognise the relative autonomy of sport. The administration of governing bodies was generally seen as an inappropriate area for state direction and the Advisory Sports Council maintained a position as a mainly independent intermediary between

governing bodies, government and local authorities - even though the Minister for Sport's influence was apparent. A more directive state involvement became evident in the mid-1970s as sport - and the Sports Council in particular - was called upon to meet social objectives for a government facing economic crises and social instability - especially in urban areas. This is epitomised in the Labour Government's White Paper on Sport and Recreation (1975), which stated that,

the Government accept that recreation should be regarded as one of the community's everyday needs and that provision for it is part of the general fabric of the social services (4).

Sport was at this point in time seen in official rhetoric as part of the state welfare system, and government began to play a more conspicuous role. The Labour Minister for Sport in 1964-70 and 1974-79, Denis Howell, played a significant part in developing such an instrumental role for sport. In reflecting in the mid-1980s on whether sport should have been called on to fulfil a social purpose he is reported by Coalter et al. (1986) to have had no misgivings, stating:

If sport didn't have any role in developing social purpose and social philosophy, it would be irrelevant. If sport is servicing the people of the country ... it must take account of the changing nature of the social challenge which we all have to face. This is not the Sports Council representing the voluntary bodies of sport. This is the Sports Council expressing a social purpose which has to be done through existing statutory agencies (5).

This explicit statement confirms the approach of a Minister for Sport in the 1960s and 70s towards a statist policy in the

development of sport. It is to be argued in this chapter and later that the nature of this social purpose, which is not specified in the above statement, was not just confined to providing sport and recreation facilities as a service to the people of Britain per se; but that provision of sports amenities served to fulfil political objectives - that of fostering the corporate planning approach of a Labour Government in the 1960s, of providing support for a policy which in the mid-1970s sought to demonstrate that assistance was being given to declining inner-urban areas, and to bolster up the government cuts in public expenditure through restraints on facility development, cost-cutting exercises and the rationalisation of resources.

This was not just the result of the pressure of an individual Minister. The Minister's interest would have been important, but the implementation required wider Government acceptance. The 1975 White Paper was significant in signalling greater government intervention as sport and recreation assumed an increasingly important role in urban social policy in relation to other forms of social, economic and environmental deprivation. The Department of the Environment intervened directly through the Urban Aid Programme investment in recreational facilities which in a few years exceeded the total grant-in-aid to the Sports Council (6).

The political value of sport and recreation can be seen to have been extended in the 1980s both through the adaptation of Sports Council policies with the entrepreneurial ideology of the Conservative Government, and in more direct intervention by Ministers of State. The Sports Council's emphasis on managerial efficiency, corporate planning and commercial sponsorship identified with the Thatcher Government's ideological commitment to individualism, enterprise, privatisation and authoritarianism. At the same time, the Prime Minister and successive

Ministers for Sport made political capital out of the world-wide media coverage of sport to put pressure on other governments in foreign affairs and to win support for authoritarian policies at home.

However, a statist approach is not confined to the social democratic policies of the Labour Governments of 1964-70 and 1974-79, nor the radical Right programme of the Thatcher Conservative administrations of 1979-83 and 1983-87. The Left has also embraced the area of sport and recreation, notably in the local state and a form of municipal socialism in the 1980s - particularly through the policies of the Greater London Council which emphasised decentralisation and positive discrimination for underprivileged groups.

A third representation of the political dimension of sport arises not within the voluntary organisations of sport nor the government departments, quasi-government agencies, or individual politicians, but within civil society - the mass of participants expressing interests and concerns about physical activity in relation to health or pleasure as a spontaneous movement not necessarily linked to governing bodies of sport nor Sports Council schemes. In this conception of politics, espoused, for example, by Stuart Hall (1984), sport and recreation are included along with other cultural activities, whose significance rests less in the nature of those activities for themselves, but as dimensions of everyday life in which values are formed. Thus sports activities represent an area which could potentially be exploited further to contribute to wider changes in regard to power in society - the relations between institutions and individuals, men and women, whites and blacks, rich and poor, the privileged and underprivileged. In this analysis physical activities are important in as much as opportunities are provided for participation and involvement rather than passive consumption of

commercial entertainment and a media based leisure industry; for access on an equal basis to all social groups; and for how participants are encouraged to share in decision making in the various events and activities.

This characterisation of approaches to politics in sport - of the assertion of sport as being above politics, of the tendency towards state involvement in sport, and of the concern for making political 'sport and culture' outside of the state, represent three distinctive positions which need to be taken into account in examining and explaining the policy developments in sport in the period from the late 1950s. The concern will be to critically assess in more detail for what purposes the state became increasingly involved in sport and recreation, how this involvement occurred and what role various sports interests played. The chapter attempts to show how the production of meaning in and about sport was constructed and controlled, contested and negotiated mainly at the national institutional level of policy making.

Pressure For and Resistance to the Establishment of a Sports Council

Why in the late 1950s was a Sports Council being proposed and what were the social and political reasons for this? Whose interests were being served and whose challenged by such a recommendation? It is argued here that these issues cannot be explained simply on pluralist lines of competing interest groups, and that it is necessary to take into account wider political factors - the structural conditions as well as the institutional human practices. Indeed, it is apparent that the political dimensions of sport and recreation at this time were

subject to a complexity of forces. These included the interests of sports bodies for improved organisation and financing, the desire for greater international achievements, and the concerns of key individuals to retain and extend the educational influence in physical recreation. But also important was the focus on economic growth, the rise in real wages and the expansion of a consumer market, the anticipated problems and opportunities associated with further technological developments and the increase in leisure time, and the growing concern with the declining influence of the community and family, and the related problems of an increasingly independent youth. It is proposed to analyse these factors at two levels: firstly, in regard to their legitimacy role for the state, and secondly, in regard to changes in power relations within the relevant organisations.

In examining the legitimacy role of sport and recreation in the late 1950s and early 1960s it is necessary to recognise that the place of cultural activities was set in a climate of economic and political objectives of maintaining Britain's power position in competitive international markets, and of furthering material progress and the ideology of affluence. The Conservative Party, in power from 1951-64, presided over a period in which full employment without inflation had been achieved in the early 1950s, and when economic growth was both an aim for fiscal policy and for an ideology which served to bring about consensus between the Conservative Party and the Labour party with a lessening of class antagonism. However, in economic terms, the achievement of growth was relative, for although it is recorded by Pinto-Duschinsky (1970) that in the years from 1951 to 1964 the British economy was growing faster than at any time since the peak of the Victorian era, Britain also lagged behind almost all of her main industrial competitors, and failed to solve the problem of sterling (7). In addition, although the domestic priority of an

extended housing programme was presented as a social service to give as many people as possible a stake in the housing system, it has also been seen as a temporary palliative for immediate political return which benefited the upper echelons of the working class and the middle classes - the prospective as well as traditional Tory voters (8). The economic policies of the time thus contained two elements: there was a commitment to growth and a popular support for increased consumption, but on the other hand, there were concerns by the Government about Britain's performance relative to other countries. Accordingly there was pressure from the centre - evident in the mass of government reports of the period - towards the reconstruction of the infrastructure of institutions to more effectively cope with economic demands and the social implications of these. Both education and recreation institutions were involved.

In the field of Education, the Crowther Report (1959) on the '15 - 18 Age Group' expressed its concern to prevent wasted human resources, particularly the 'second quartile ability range' which it was considered would have to be exploited if Britain was to keep a place among the nations that were in 'the van of spiritual and material progress' (9). The report reasoned that if Britain was to build a 'higher standard of living' and, more importantly, if it was to have 'higher standards in life' it would need a firmer educational base (10). Crowther indeed argued in the context of a 'moral panic' about the behaviour of young people, that youth needed a preparation for industry which employers could no longer provide. Reference was made to the 'no man's land between school and work', and that help and support was needed through a difficult period marked by a male juvenile delinquency (11). It held that many pupils had too little to do and that their lack of ability and purpose suggested that directed activities would be required outside school hours and terms (12).

The Albemarle Report (1960) on the Youth Service similarly addressed the problem of youth in relation to economic and social change, recognising the replacement of cultural and geographical structures by a new kind of stratification based on the economic and the educational. In other words a reinforcement of social class divisions. It was held that although this brought about difficulties for those at the bottom of the sorting process, it was a necessary price to pay for material growth. The report states:

Much of this separating into functions .
is necessary if British society is
to maintain and improve its standard
of living. But clearly it exacts
penalties, unless guided with
unremitting care, especially on the
emotional life of those who, at the most
disturbed period of their lives, are
subject to both a new openness and a new
stratification (13).

It thus showed a concern about the effect of economic growth on those most adversely affected, but actually upheld the structural framework which brought about this condition. The Albemarle Report clearly focused on the world of young people, elaborating on the widespread attacks on youth delinquency. Although the report took a more positive view about adolescents than the cliches about youth as 'materialist' and 'without moral values', and emphasised that it was not taking an educational or moralistic position in reclaiming the lost or preventing delinquency, nevertheless its aims of 'association', 'training' and 'challenge' seem almost as cliched. Its recommendations for improved organisation, finance and leadership included the provision for physical recreation for the school-leaver and it drew attention to the gap which existed between school and adult life (14). Within this organisational focus it argued that there should be a much clearer and more effective linking-up between the Youth Service - statutory and voluntary - and the bodies responsible for games and sports (15).

However, the underlying social purpose is contained in the section 'The Youth Service and Society', where it is recommended that the Youth Service should try to 'provide for the unattached and those who find it difficult to come to terms with society' (16). This statement is revealing for it assumes that the failing is in the victims rather than the system itself. The report was essentially concerned with reviewing how the Youth Service could assist young people to play their part in the life of the community, but it neglected to do more than describe the breakdown in the communities which were being destroyed by the building and construction programme of a Conservative Government.

It was within this economic, social and political context that the Wolfenden Committee was set up by the Central Council of Physical Recreation as an independent Committee under Sir John Wolfenden in October 1957 to examine the general position of sport in Britain and to recommend what action should be taken by statutory and voluntary bodies. The decision to set up this Committee was made, according to Stanley Rous, the Chairman of the C.C.P.R., because of a general and growing feeling that some new initiative was required if sport - in its broadest sense, professional and amateur, indoor and outdoor - was to be enabled to expand and develop in the light of the needs and standards of the time (17). The report, published in 1960, under the title 'Sport and the Community' indicated that the needs the Wolfenden Committee had particularly in mind throughout its inquiries were 'the needs of young people', and the standards cited relate to the 'development of qualities valuable to the individual and to society' (18). However, young people's needs are conceived in relation to conforming and deviant behaviour, of the concerns of the

time about juvenile delinquency, and the lack of opportunities or lack of desire for suitable physical activity as a contributory factor in the increasing trend of delinquency .

Although it is acknowledged that the causes of criminal behaviour are complex, and care is taken not to suggest that it would disappear with the provision of more tennis courts or running tracks, nevertheless the argument is presented that,

... it is a reasonable assumption
that if more young people had
opportunities for playing games
fewer of them would develop
criminal habits (19).

This position represents a continuation of the rational recreation theme which, as indicated in Chapter Two, was evident in the latter half of the 19th Century and in the 1930s. The needs of youth are defined in terms of the needs of established liberal society.

Wolfenden conveys this liberalism and paternalism in the rhetoric of making a case for increased state aid for sport and recreation, picking up on the prevailing concerns of the leisure time of youth as expressed also in Crowther and Albemarle. The Wolfenden Report, furthermore, defines a place for sport as a whole (i.e. any sport, which is chiefly engaged in for enjoyment and recreation - from cricket to climbing and from boxing to badminton) within its focus on 'the general welfare of the community'. This emphasis on 'community' and reference to the 'welfare' value of 'play' as expressed in sport and recreation is related to the predictions of the changing patterns of work and leisure. The General Introduction indicates:

It is not an accident that this recognition of the community aspect of sport should occur early in our Report. For play is at once a social and an individual phenomenon ... a society which has the prospect of considerably increased leisure needs to look at this aspect, of its corporate life more closely (20).

The predictions of an increase in leisure time were certainly being discussed, though in a speculative rather than an informed way in this period of the Wolfenden Committee's enquiries from 1957-60. In addition to references in the Crowther Report (1959) and the Albemarle Report (1960) both the major political parties produced pre-election pamphlets on the subject in 1959 (the Labour Party in 'Leisure for Living' and the Conservative Party in 'The Challenge of Leisure') and in 1960 the House of Lords engaged in a debate on 'Problems and Opportunities of Leisure' (21). The prospect of automatic processes and labour saving inventions bringing an age of mass leisure was viewed with foreboding by the Earl of Arran in introducing the House of Lords debate (22). 'Satan finds some mischief still' was the message he conveyed, the paternalistic concern being about how to occupy 'tens of millions of leisured persons with few responsibilities and with incomplete education'. His suggestions for resolving the problems were to point to the institutions of the church, education and trade unions, but also to 'the cultural organisations, the voluntary organisations and the sporting organisations' (23).

The Wolfenden Committee can be seen as an initiative which anticipated the notion that there were opportunities to be gained in the changing structures of society through expanded provision for sport and its case for increased state support was accordingly presented against the more general concerns of the 'problem of youth' the 'problem of leisure' and the 'problem of community provision', as well

as the more specific issues of coaching, organisation and finance. The legitimacy role that sport might fulfil for society was thus articulated by a Committee set up by and reporting to, a voluntary organisation. The approach was flavoured by a liberal-humanist ideology - as indicated in Chapter One - which whilst seeking an improved structure in the financing and organisational development of a whole range of sports sought to exert an influence on the values adopted by governing bodies, emphasising the importance of 'integrity', 'responsibility', 'duty', 'balance' and 'respect' in the way that sport was administered. This was evident in references to the need for greater co-operation and integration between governing bodies (24), the feeling that national prestige should be kept within reasonable bounds, and that the benefits derived from and conferred by international sport should not be confined to national teams of the highest standard (25), and the recommendations that governing bodies should end the anomalies arising from their different attitudes to amateurism and should accept the duty of ensuring that whatever definitions or rules they laid down were observed (26).

Wolfenden in essence was reviewing the standards and approaches to the organisation of sport and it interpreted these within the framework of a moral code of conduct which fitted in to the claims for the qualities that could be derived from participation in sport - particularly games of a competitive kind - and which included 'courage, endurance, self discipline, determination and self reliance'. In this respect Wolfenden reflected the model of sport being above politics outlined in the introduction to the chapter. Sport was seen to be a natural expression of play, and an enjoyable pursuit which could be of value in health and educational terms, and which should keep within perspective and control the media focus on national success, the pressures towards winning at all costs, and the sensationalism and

ill-balanced judgements of the press. However, the process of interpreting the role of sport in a liberal, humanistic and paternalistic way, which articulated the needs of society as the development of individual qualities of behaviour and of the improvement of the general welfare of the community, far from being a-political, provided support for the political hegemony of a rationalisation of the infra-structure of British institutions. The underlying objectives were to more efficiently cope with the effects of economic and social change through organisational measures which largely ignored the source of problems in the community and adapted to the dominant forces in society - which included adjustment to the emerging power of the media and television. Alongside the moral exhortations the Wolfenden Report encouraged national sports bodies to adjust themselves to the problems that television created for some of them (para. 223). It is in this frame of reference that the major recommendation of Wolfenden - the establishment of a Sports Development Council with Treasury grant to distribute to composite bodies and national associations - needs to be interpreted.

In addition to the legitimatory role of sport for the state, there is a second political dimension stemming from the purposes of Wolfenden to achieve statutory assistance. This relates to the power relations of the vested interests which were being contested within the particular concerns of the Wolfenden Committee in finding a new structure for sport and recreation. It is important to stress that although the terms of reference of this national inquiry were claimed in the General Introduction to the Wolfenden Report to have been interpreted widely and comprehensively, the debate on significant issues was quite closely confined. It is certainly true that a large number of people were consulted through the presentation of written evidence, interview by the committee, or meetings with the Chairman (27). But many of these were questioned only on the nature of their

apparent field of expertise, its organisation, operation and requirements. The really vital questions - the relationship between Government and local authorities and proposed arrangements for structuring a new grant-aiding authority - were directed to a few politicians and professionals and contacts of members of the committee (28).

In relation to the key aspects of the subject of inquiry a clear division of interest was evident. On the one hand, there were those who argued for the continuation of the close link with education; and on the other, those who looked for a means of establishing a new administrative arrangement for sport in a wider context. The advocates for education included Phyllis Colson, the General Secretary of the C.C.P.R., the Association of Education Committees and the Ministry of Education H.M.I. representatives. Opposed to them, and for the proposal to establish a Sports Council - on the lines of the Arts Council or University Grants Committee - were the Chairman of the investigating committee, Sir John Wolfenden, and the Parliamentary Sports Committee (particularly P.B. Lucas - Conservative, E. Burton - Labour, P. Noel-Baker - Labour and I. Mikardo - Labour, who all gave oral evidence).

The most explicit and forceful case for the continuing link with education and against the formation of a Sports Council was elaborated by the General Secretary of the C.C.P.R. This was based on four arguments (29):

- (i) That the nature of physical recreation itself must be regarded as an enjoyable type of further education, and that the divorce of physical recreation from education at the centre would be an illogicality if

the link was continued at the periphery with L.E.A.s (which in her view was essential).

- (ii) That a Sports Council with executive functions would overlap or duplicate unless some existing bodies were 'killed or changed' - meaning the C.C.P.R. and British Olympic Association (and this, she felt, would be a pity if they were doing their job properly).
- (iii) That the experience of a similar proposal - the National Fitness Council, 22 years earlier - was a tragic wastage of public money, with overlapping and acrimonious relationships between professional bodies affected.
- (iv) That if a Sports Council were a grant-making body it would have to build up strong and expensive administrative machinery and employ a large number of expert advisers.

Inter alia, Miss Colson here reveals her philosophy for sport and recreation and her ambitions for the state supported voluntary organisation she largely created. In essence, her argument gives priority to the educational benefits of sport for the masses over and above international sport. What is also expressed is a fear for the survival both of the C.C.P.R. and the continued dominance of education. Her arguments posed structural, relational and financial difficulties for those contemplating change. However, her position although challenging that of the wider sporting interests can be seen as similar in its liberal approach.

That there was little co-ordinated support for her cause on the Committee would appear to have been a reflection of the degree of tension which existed between the Ministry of Education and the sports representatives. H.J. Evans, the Deputy General Secretary of the

C.C.P.R. and Secretary to the Wolfenden Committee, commented later that,

if the Ministry of Education had genuinely shown feelings of support and interest this would have been pursued; but they displayed little enthusiasm, and it was difficult for the Wolfenden Committee to obtain contact with them at a sufficiently high level - above subject inspector (30).

The oral evidence given by the Ministry of Education was, in fact, presented by four H.M.I.'s. Their case, though arguing for continuation of the existing education control, revealed the antipathy to international sport, which as indicated in Chapter Two seemed to be a strong impetus behind the establishment of 'Wolfenden' - even though the committee addressed sport in a wider community and mass recreation context. H.M.I. E. Major considered that the existing machinery could easily be extended to operate efficiently by increasing the personnel involved and that the Ministry had a very sound knowledge of what was going on in the field of sport (31). However, he admitted that it was the Ministry's current policy to aid only the educational side of the governing bodies work and the assistance to governing bodies for international competition was not permitted. He also indicated his resistance to Wolfenden by expressing the view that public opinion was not yet ready for the state to take a greater part in grant-aiding adult sport, with the tradition of voluntary participation so strongly entrenched. The opposition of the Ministry of Education to financing overseas activities of individuals or teams was endorsed by the Minister, Sir David Eccles, in a confidential talk with the Chairman in January 1960 (32). It was reported that Sir David had expressed his doubts about favourable reaction from the Treasury to any suggestion of a grant-aiding body outside the Ministry based on the pattern of the Development Commission. He had implied, too, that his Ministry might eventually become a Ministry of 'Education, Culture and Sport',

transferring responsibility for physical recreation to local authorities at the end of a five-year initial period. This would indeed have threatened the independence and ambition of Wolfenden and his committee, intent themselves on constructing a new deal for sport.

The other protagonist for Education, the Association of Education Committees, was wholly against the concept of establishing any central body to cover a diparate field. Dr. W.P. Alexander, in particular, raised strong objections to the establishment of separate councils to allocate money, to disguise the fact that the Government had failed to do what it could have done through normal machinery (33). His expressed fear was that because the Ministry had so far failed to make adequate provision in this field, the Wolfenden Committee would say that the machinery was at fault and a Sports Council would do the job better. He argued that this would only mean the diversion of moneys from other purposes. On the other hand, the idea of an advisory council to advise the Minister on the amount of money needed for the central administration of sport was considered acceptable.

The issue was thus one of control. Education bodies and the C.C.P.R. General Secretary wanted to retain power in the hands of the Ministry of Education; the select group of sports representatives challenged this. The division was evident from an early stage of the Wolfenden proceedings, but sharpened in the last of the three years of investigation. By November, 1959 the Chairman had clearly indicated his reservations, declaring in questioning the C.C.P.R. General Secretary that,

the Ministry has two disabilities in people's minds as a body for grant-aiding sport: it was not very interested in it, and was last in the queue when money was given out (34).

Both points were, however, rejected by Miss Colson. The determination of the Wolfenden Committee on this issue is made clear by the evidence that its decision to support the Chairman's view (that an independent body to assist sport should be recommended) was made on 25th February 1960 - before oral evidence had even been heard from the Association of Education Committees (35). The degree of feeling against the case being put by the Education lobby from Sir John Wolfenden himself is apparent from the request by some members of the committee that critical references to the Ministry of Education should be modified from the initial drafts (36).

A key argument in the case for an independent Sports Council was that the Committee were dealing with a much wider and heterogeneous field than youth and physical recreation. This is apparent in the minuted discussion of members of the Wolfenden Committee on the Albemarle Report's recommendations on the subject of physical recreation. It was felt that Albemarle's recommendation that local authorities should encourage physical recreation through financial resistance might not in practice lead to material gains for sport. Aid to sport might be given low priority in block grant distribution. Wolfenden's members wished to sustain their argument for the establishment of an independent body rather than conform to Albemarle's support for local authorities and local education authorities as the grant awarding bodies (37). They were therefore, in this context, concerned to distinguish their field of interests from that of being only about youth. In addition, one of the aims of Wolfenden, embracing sport in a broad context in its terms of reference, was to gain support for a new deal from a wide range of activities and branches of sport; this was intended to loosen the dominance of the rather narrower conception of sport with recreation and its predominantly paternalistic middle class framework which had prevailed since the establishment of

the C.C.R.P.T. in 1935. The health and fitness orientation of the 1930s and 40s was indeed being replaced by a definition of community sport which placed as much emphasis on international competition and national prestige as character and enjoyment. Even though the Wolfenden Report took a guarded position on too much enthusiasm about national success, the Minutes indicate that,

The Committee decided that though enjoyment was an essential element in most forms of participation in sport, this could not be isolated from the other elements such as the effect on character and health, its contribution to happy community life and the connection with group or national prestige (38).

The paradox is that the predominantly humanistic and liberal Wolfenden Committee acting supposedly as the 'Guardians of Sport' in a responsible and overtly disinterested fashion set in train - by its recommendation of a grant-aiding Sports Council - a series of events which, far from giving greater independence to the national administration of sport, moved it closer to state control and influence. As indicated in the introduction to the chapter, a statist approach to sports provision with the political aim of using it for social objectives, became clearer by the mid-1970s. As a quasi-governmental organisation in the post-1972 period the Sports Council was drawn into legitimising instrumental welfare policies. Its declared support for the social values of physical recreation and its 'Sport for all' focus was identified with a Labour led policy for sport which acted as a displacement for the real economic and social decline of Britain's inner cities. The problem with this closer connection between sport and the state was not so much its identification of social need nor the provision of greater opportunities for deprived groups, but in the deeper political significance of helping maintain the hegemony of structural inequality of gender, race and social class. These points will be further developed later in the chapter.

In the late 1950s the challenge of the Wolfenden Committee can be interpreted as a significant attempt to free sport and recreation from one kind of state connection, that of the Ministry of Education. It was a kind of liberalism which aimed to provide greater autonomy for a broader and more inclusive representation of sport, as against a liberalism of the voluntary body, the Central Council of Physical Recreation as led by Phyllis Colson. But Wolfenden was also about the growth of sport and gaining greater financial support from the state. It showed both a pluralism in developing an independent administrative machinery, and a greater relationship with the state - in terms of gaining financial support.

The Wolfenden debate and proposals were one thing: a case had been made for a new deal and structural arrangements for sport and recreation. But this national inquiry - which, as I have pointed out was limited to certain key bodies - did not on its own achieve the break with the older forms of control. A Sports Council didn't just emerge; it had to be fought for and seen to be of worth to the nation, and this meant party political weight was necessary to get it established. This was mainly a Labour inspired affair, but in responding to the Wolfenden recommendations both political parties took up distinctive positions which need to be illuminated. It is not just the case that sport was recognised as serving broadly political purposes in alleviating the problem of leisure or youth disorder. The political parties differed in certain respects on how these matters should be addressed.

There has been a tendency to overlook or underrate the political party differences in regard to the stance taken towards providing state aid for sport and recreation in the early 1960s. Evans (1974) comments on the contribution of politicians to the debate over state aid in the 1950s and early 1960s but tends to eschew any analysis of the role of politics or the nature of party differences. McIntosh (1985) states,

'the aims and objectives of the new government in 1964 differed little from those of the previous government' in terms of stating a policy for sport. Hargreaves (1986) and Coalter et al. (1986) confirm that direct management and control from the centre was largely absent in 1965; and the former, in particular, emphasises that whichever government was in power from the mid-1960s until the late 1970s a corporatist style of intervention formed part of a social democratic programme. It is true to say that in 1959 both Conservative and Labour party pamphlets stated a case for increased aid from central government and recommended the setting up of a Sports Council. In addition, the phenomenon of leisure, its problems and opportunities, was being addressed in parliament in 1960 in a way hitherto unknown, with both sides of the House of Lords expressing the view that there was a role for government in the development of leisure. Viscount Hailsham, (Lord Privy Seal and Minister for Science), stated:

Both sides of the House are aware that there is work for the Government to do which is probably best done by Government and which can be done without undermining, but rather by encouraging the use by the individual of the free faculties which he has been given (39).

However, distinctive approaches were evident in the aftermath of the Wolfenden Report, and these followed ideological differences between the two major parties. The Conservative position expressed by Lord Hailsham - who was given special responsibility for Sport in 1962 - upheld the principles of voluntarism and pointed to the dangers of bureaucratisation in setting up a Sports Council. On taking responsibility for co-ordinating the development of sporting and recreational facilities Lord Hailsham announced that,

expenditure to sport ... is not a matter that can be solved in the government's view by creating another

agency that would be interposed
between the responsible Ministers
and local authorities (40).

He later reiterated this point arguing that the existing machinery for aiding sport - the Ministry of Education - was adequate and indeed that his aim had been, in the first place, to see 'what improvements we could make quickly through the existing machinery rather than to hold things up by organisational changes and large scale surveys' (41).

The Conservative Government, indeed, whilst agreeing with the diagnosis of the Wolfenden Report did not agree with the remedy it proposed of establishing a Sports Development Council. The position adopted by the Minister with responsibility for Sport was to appoint a Committee of officials under the Chairmanship of Sir Patrick Renison, former Governor of Kenya (42) . This body was representative of the state departments concerned with Sport and Recreation - notably, the Ministry of Education and the Ministry of Housing and Local Government. By such a device, of the formation of a bureaucracy of officials, Lord Hailsham kept close control of the state's support and involvement with sport and resolutely resisted attempts by other politicians - mainly Labour (43) - to establish a more independent Sports Development Council. The rhetoric of the Conservative Government was one of social responsibility and protection for the underprivileged, arguing that a Sports Development Council would interpose between government and existing bodies and would be likely to aid the already aided (44). In practice, the attitude towards support for sport was less than generous towards those in need, and what was provided depended, in some cases, on political considerations. As Baroness Burton revealed, on the matter of sports organisations' applications for assistance with travel for amateur events overseas, the main criterion was whether political dividends would flow in relations between Britain and other countries (45).

The Labour approach, on the other hand, favoured state co-ordination and intervention, the establishment of a Sports Council being an expression of this central planning focus. A number of Labour M.P.s conveyed this position in various ways. Three such approaches are outlined here before making some general analysis. Richard Marsh, M.P. for Greenwich, underlined the need for Government responsibility as a counter to big business and commercial domination, though this was advocated mainly in relation to the purpose of competing internationally. He argued in a House of Commons debate (1961) that:

... we are in danger of underestimating the effect on international prestige of perpetual defeats in some fields and of growing victories by other nations. One does not want to turn sport into a political issue, but we must face the fact that to some extent sport has become internationally an instrument of political propaganda. The nation has a job to do to ensure that, at least, in the eyes of the world, it is able to compete on equal terms with sports teams from other countries ... We must face the fact that there is need for Government intervention on quite a large scale in sport. One cannot expect voluntary bodies to produce the kind of sports stadium that is essential ... the days when we could compete in the international field of sport by passing boxes around and running raffles for pots of jam have gone. This has become big business, and if we do not want to see it completely commercialised the Government have to accept the responsibility (46).

Denis Howell, M.P. Birmingham, Small Heath, also supported the case for Government assistance, for 'national well being', for 'spending leisure time profitably and fruitfully' for 'letting off steam in the proper manner' and for 'character building qualities'. He also added that one of the first duties of a Sports Council would be to 'survey the field and to draw up a schedule of requirements as between one area and another' (47). Ian Mikardo in giving evidence to the Wolfenden Committee focused on 'planning', but also 'need' indicating that, 'he felt that local authorities usually provided their

facilities without any co-ordination with one another or with national bodies'. He also thought it important that money must only go where it was needed, and that some sports were capable of looking after themselves. He suggested that the distinction should not be drawn so much between amateur and professional sports as between sports which were a business and those which were not. Mr. Mikardo further made mention of his concerns about how much confidence could be placed in some of the governing bodies of sport in terms of abuses in the way in which money was spent. He argued that there was a duty to see that money was spent rightly, that some bodies were self-perpetuating, and that some organisations might use their grant to build themselves palatial headquarters, unless there were control. He is minuted as indicating that he would unashamedly use the power of the central sports council to put things right and place political restraints on certain practices (48).

These statements by Labour politicians though emphasising different views show broad agreement on the expansion of public support for sport, and for the establishment of a central controlling and planning body. Concerns were expressed about the way in which sport was administered and in some cases - including Richard Marsh and Denis Howell - the importance of national achievement and well-being was stressed. There was a view communicated here that British prestige abroad would suffer without state aid, and this had resonances with the Britain in the World of Sport Report (1956) and the Wolfenden Committee Report (1960) and, indeed, that success in sport might in some way offset Britain's relatively declining importance in the economic, political and military spheres highlighted earlier in the chapter. There is also in Marsh's and Mikardo's comments an apprehension about the prospect of allowing sport and recreation to become subject to market forces and that the state or its agent should intervene to ensure that the self interest of commercial practices was countered.

A different kind of statist arrangement for sport was thus put forward in response to Wolfenden's request for state aid. The Conservative Party answer was based on minimal change and the co-ordination of the range of statutory interests by a committee of officials. The Labour Party objective was to establish a Sports Council which would adopt a long term planning perspective on a national and regional basis. At that particular time, in the early 1960s, the impact on governing bodies and local authorities was minimal. Much of the activity was at a national level of discourse, through the C.C.P.R. and a few politicians. It was a preparatory phase. Nevertheless, it was a significant one in the sense of developing an impetus for the important state intervention in establishing a Sports Council within a short period of the Labour Party gaining power in 1964. The implications of this step will be analysed in the following section.

In summarising the pressures for and resistance to the establishment of a Sports Council it is necessary to see the debate between sports bodies in the context of the economic, social and political background agenda of the late 1950s and early 1960s. This consisted of the political sensitivity to Britain's relative position in world markets and a concern with national status and the achievement of organisational efficiency; of the apprehension which changes in the mode of production indicated in the increase in time free from work and the use of this particularly by working class youth; and the political pressure for containment of community breakdown as a result of the decline of traditional industries. It was not so much that Labour or Conservative politicians as a whole saw sport and recreation as a priority, but that developments in sport were - like developments in other institutions - focused on generating reconstruction for changing economic and social conditions. The way in which divisions between

Education interests and broader Sport and Recreation interests were contested and resolved was not just a pluralistic notion of competing groups in a vacuum. The thrust of the Sport and Recreation lobby for organisational change was in harmony with national prestige, the reshaping of institutions and provision for increased leisure time. However, this connection should not be seen either as a direct correspondence model, reflecting in a mechanistic way the political and social pressures. There was in the discourse over sport and recreation a specific set of circumstances and issues which made it distinctive, and not just a microcosm of developments in capitalist society. Yet the political forces for change were significant, for it was only when the Labour Party gained power in 1964 that the key organisational innovation recommended by the Wolfenden Committee - the establishment of a Sports Council - was implemented.

The Structuring, Process and Effects of State Intervention

A central theme of the study has been the transition that has taken place in the way that sport and recreation has been subject to influence by the state. This has been especially marked in the 20 year period from 1965 to 1985 when two shifts occurred in the position adopted by the state: from a facilitative to supportive, then supportive to directive role. This section examines further the purposes behind state intervention, the way in which this was structured institutionally, the process by which this was brought about and the effects of intervention on the governing bodies of sport, the local state and the physical education body.

The background to the reasons for the state's interest in the 1950s and early 1960s has been identified in the previous section as relating firstly, to how predictions of problems relating to an

increase in leisure time were interpreted by the establishment as an opportunity to socialise subordinate groups - sport and physical recreation being given some prominence in this function; secondly, to the scope for assisting British prestige abroad through aiding the financing and administration of sport - essentially the governing bodies; and thirdly, to the ways in which central institutions might be reshaped to produce greater efficiency and to preserve the legitimisation of the system. These purposes were reinforced in the establishment by a Labour Government of an Advisory Sports Council in 1965. The expressed concern of the newly-appointed Minister for Sport, Denis Howell, was for a sports forum which could innovate and expand with new proposals, but in achieving this he appeared to be concerned not with the independence of sport from the state, but rather to bring sport under greater Ministerial influence - though in a manner different from that of the Conservatives. This is revealed in the line taken by the Labour Government on return to power in 1964. The incoming Government under Harold Wilson had appealed to the electorate on the platform of national planning for a new technological age. Within this corporate emphasis of co-ordination between national and local state and other agencies, the conception of a Sports Council as earlier defined by Denis Howell - which would survey sport as a whole as well as stimulating and inspiring, promoting and enthusing - fitted in and helped reinforce the larger political objectives of corporate planning (49). Hargreaves (1986) emphasises the class nature of this approach in arguing that the significance of the movement in the 1960s towards a restructuring of the state apparatus along corporalist lines lay in its strategic purpose for defusing and depoliticising class conflict (50). It would appear that the objectives of the Minister for Sport at this time were to more generally improve the provision for sport rather than explicitly achieve social aims of depoliticising class conflict. Nevertheless, the appointment of an Advisory Sports Council had a significance in

both strengthening the corporatist movement of institutional planning at central and local government level and in providing a structure which in time shifted the balance between the state and the voluntary and independent nature of sport and recreation - to a strengthening of the former. In addition, by responding to demand for facility provision on a broad basis, it actually reinforced class inequalities and helped maintain the political hegemony of social democracy.

The corporate approach to planning for sport was given prominence throughout the period of the Labour Government 1964-1970. The tasks for the new Advisory Sports Council were indeed defined and determined by the Minister for Sport in 1965, and included standards of provision, surveys of resources and regional planning, likely capital expenditure and setting priorities in sports development (51). A Working Party set up by the Sports Council in 1965 to consider and make recommendations on the scale of provision of facilities emphasised the important role of local authorities in co-ordination and planning, and of the need for co-operation between local authorities, voluntary organisations and other bodies (52). In reviewing the period 1966-69 the Sports Council indicated how the public sector had become relatively more significant than voluntary and commercial enterprise recreation provision. The importance of co-ordination of services was stressed and the moves towards strengthening corporate management in local authorities were welcomed as a means to improved planning for sport. (53). Both as a strategy for releasing capital for sport and recreation, largely through local authorities, and for constructing harmonious relationships between the various sectors of provision and between providers and consumers, a state corporatist approach was presented as the logical way forward by an Advisory Sports Council under the Chairmanship of the Minister for Sport. A planning

perspective was promoted in a variety of ways: through listing a range of areas for development and assessment; by setting up national, regional and local organisations - in establishing the Sports Council, regional sports councils and local sports councils; and stressing government assistance through the concept of 'partnership' and a 'new spirit of co-operation' linking Government, local authorities and the governing bodies of sport (54).

Coalter et al. indicate that for both the Minister (Denis Howell) and senior C.C.P.R. officers (although not all executive members) the arrangement of having the Minister for Sport as Chairman of the Advisory Sports Council, the C.C.P.R. Secretary seconded as its Director, with the regional staff servicing the new Regional Sports Councils represented 'the best of all possible worlds' (55). The 1969 Advisory Sports Councils report also conveyed the view that it benefited from obtaining greater co-operation than it might otherwise expect both from local authorities and central government, stating:

There is much value in the direct contact which the present advisory Sports Council has with the Government and government departments. This relationship has encouraged local authorities to lend support to the consultation and planning role of regional sports councils ... These councils are proving successful in their function because those who participate see the councils as a useful extension of the machinery of Government. An executive Sports Council might run the risk of losing the co-operation of local authorities in regional planning for development of sport and could not expect the same access to Government as it now enjoys (56).

However, the statism of Labour in sport and recreation in the 1960s although overtly recognising the sovereignty and independence of governing bodies in policy statements - such as the Minister for Sport's Introduction to the Sports Council Review of 1966-1969 - in practice constructed a system which in time reduced the autonomy of

sports organisations, eroded the influence of physical education and failed to provide for working class groups. Several contradictions can be identified. Firstly, the organisation of sport was brought more closely under state control when Howell - as Minister for Sport - presented to the House of Commons on 3rd February, 1965 the Government's plans to establish a Sports Council (57). Of particular significance was the appointment of the Minister of Sport as Chairman of the Council, as already indicated, and the role of the Prime Minister - effectively Howell - in selecting the members of the Council. This act was a watershed in the relationship between sport and the state. Up to this point quite close contact had existed between government departments and sport, particularly in the late 1930s when the state was resorting to a variety of ways of coping with the crisis of unemployment through the National Fitness Council. In the period 1962-65, a holding function had been performed by the Conservative government in that it had resisted pressures from the Labour Party and sports bodies for creating a new national co-ordinating institution of sport. But what was new about the situation with Labour's establishment of the Sports Council was the direct mediation of a Minister of State through personal involvement and control of this body. It may be that the Sports Council was only of advisory status but as Lord Snow pointed out,

.... when a Minister acts as Chairman
you can usually make an advisory
council do something more than give
advice. At least you can see that
advice gets put into action (58).

It is significant too that the C.C.P.R. was persuaded to second its General Secretary - Walter Winterbottom, the former England Football Team Manager (Phyllis Colson had retired in 1963) - as Director of this Labour controlled Sports Council. This move was to effectively lead to the demise of the C.C.P.R. in its existing form, and to the control of sport shifting from a voluntary centralism to public centralism.

Secondly, although in 1965 regional sports councils then local sports councils were established throughout the country in order to improve co-ordination and increase the lines of communication at local levels, in the case of the former, the C.C.P.R. acted as secretariat thus bringing the national voluntary organisation directly within the political requirements of the Advisory Sports Council dominated by a Labour Minister. In this way, a process of decentralisation could be said to be effected from the centre during the second half of the 1960s with the power of grant-aiding in sport being held by regional sports councils, but at the same time a structure was being erected which aided the communication between state and sport, and in due course increased the scope for greater state influence. In addition, although a good deal of activity and interest was generated by the Sports Council from 1965-72 this disguised the limited financial support that Government actually gave. Whilst two hundred and sixty four authorities were involved in consideration of project applications totalling £55,615,304 for 1971-1972 (59), the ceiling restrictions on loan sanction made it impossible for more than one or two major scheme to proceed in each region. Local authority investment on facilities used exclusively for sport and physical recreation actually declined each successive year from 1965-1966 (£16.41 million) to 1969/1970 (£8.97 million) (60). And although the initial grant of £500,000 to the Sports Council in 1965 had risen to £3½ million by 1970 this was only a moderate rise and not the kind of expansion Denis Howell himself had called for when the Conservatives were in office.

Thirdly, the control of central sports administration over individual governing bodies of sport was strengthened through the power of the Advisory Sports Council to determine the criteria of what constituted an appropriate organisation to receive government grant aid (61). As Coalter et al. point out, in this way 'via the use of

economic power, the Advisory Sports Council was directly involved in rationalising and modernising the elite sector (the voluntary governing bodies)'. However, it is important to indicate that at the same time the scope of the A.S.C. for intervening directly in formulating public leisure policy was limited since it was still dependent on local government for the major provision of facilities (62).

A further effect of the policies of the 1964-70 Labour Government in regard to sport was to weaken the ties with educationalists and physical education bodies as it strengthened the links with local authorities. This was institutionalised with the decision of Prime Minister Wilson in 1969 to locate sport in the Ministry of Housing and Local Government, thus severing the connection with the Department of Education and Science (63). The ideological significance of this lay in redefining the terrain of sport both in its official classification, and through the developing communication sought by the Advisory Sports Council in pursuing the strategy of looking to the local authorities for provision and infrastructural investment. The shift away from physical education is apparent in the structural and organisational changes in local authorities from 1965 (to be examined in more detail in Chapter Four) which led to the construction of a professional body centred on the management of recreation (The Institute of Leisure and Amenity Management). As the Yates Committee Report on Recreational Management Training (1984) pointed out,

Nowhere was the subordination of the specialist to the manager more dramatically revealed than in the operation of multi-purpose sports and leisure centres. In 1965 there was only one of its kind in the United Kingdom; now there are more than 770. Suddenly, local authorities found themselves in the recreation business in a wide sense having to come to grips with large capital costs, high running costs and more intensive and varied uses, called for

management skills and knowledge beyond those normally associated with facility management (64).

The perhaps unintended consequences of the physical education-led proposals in the 1950s to establish a Sports Council for the development of sport and recreation were that it brought about a diminution in the influence of physical education on central policy making as the Advisory Sports Council began to initiate studies into the training possibilities in recreation and management in addition to its focus on planning and research, and thus to play a significant role in creating a professionalisation process based on local authority leisure and recreation provision (65).

The statism of the Labour Party in bringing Sport and Recreation under the greater influence of its Minister for Sport might have been justifiable as a socialist objective given certain conditions. If it had provided the platform for not only restructuring and refashioning the institutions of sport but also for altering the relations of force in society to allow the working class greater control over the direction and use of the resources being released, then this statist approach might have been justified as a socialist project. However, the Labour Party's version of social change, scientific innovation, educational expansion and the development of sports provision appeared to be conceived within a framework of a liberal progressive paradigm in which the problems were located in the limitations of past organisational arrangements somehow divorced from a critique of the capitalist system. In this paradigm problems were seen as elsewhere than in the capitalist organisation of society - which socialism would focus on, and in sport the problems - lack of facilities, lack of participation, youth disorder - were seen as inhibitions to be overcome and not as symptomatic of and intrinsic to the system itself. An expanded role for the state in sport and recreation through the

establishment of an Advisory Sports Council with strong influence and support from the Minister for Sport conformed to this radical liberal ideology. There was no explicit or implicit policy towards identifying the needs of working class communities. As McIntosh and Charlton (1985) point out,

In the nineteen sixties the emphasis of policies for sport was upon people enjoying themselves as they liked, and upon providing opportunities and facilities for people to do what they were interested in. Although extrinsic benefits of sport were recognised, the justification of policy lay in enabling people to do what they wanted (66).

Such an open-ended approach to provision, although making changes in the structure of sport to set in motion the mechanisms for an increase in facilities, did little to redress inequalities in working class life-chances. Indeed, a major consideration by the Sports Council was the development of coaching at an elite level, even though there was a concern to assist local authorities to increase public provision (67). The new facilities were also utilised more by middle and skilled working class males than lower working class groups and females, and this became more evident by the mid-1970s (68) Clarke and Critcher (1985) draw attention to the Sports Council's ten most funded sports as an indication of the class and male bias in provision. These are listed as:

- | | |
|--------------|-------------------|
| 1. Squash | 6. Tennis |
| 2. Swimming | 7. Golf |
| 3. Athletics | 8. Shooting |
| 4. Sailing | 9. Cricket |
| 5. Rowing | 10. Canoeing (69) |

Clarke and Critcher also argue that,

The problem is that in the Sports Council's vision, neither sport in general nor particular sports are seen as embodying distinctive class and gender values. Instead they are treated as having universal appeal: 'sport for all'. Hence the surprise when 'take-up' is not representative of the local population (70).

Whilst there does appear to be a greater awareness by the Sports Council of the limitations of assuming a 'universal appeal' of sport in the late 1980s, the recent targeting of special groups, for example, fails to appreciate the structural dimensions of inequality. The class, gender and racial disparities cannot be resolved just by extra inner-city funding. They may even be reinforced by such policies. But in the 1960s there was not even a questioning of the general value of sport.

A fundamental development in state intervention occurred from 1970 with the return of a Conservative Government which took action to make further changes in the administrative structure of sport. It established an executive Sports Council, discontinued the practice of having the Minister for Sport as Chairman of the Sports Council, and transferred the C.C.P.R. staff and its assets to the new Sports Council. However, although these were significant changes for the detail of government and control of sport at national level, the period 1970-74 represented not so much a break or dislocation with the previous Labour Government as a consolidation of a statist approach which placed public sector provision and development over and above reliance on voluntary and private contributions, encouraged the trends of corporate management and community development, and confirmed the principles of integration, control from the top, more efficient use of money and labour, forward planning and the rationalisation of social welfare (71). In relation to its policy on sport and recreation the conservative statism was of a dual character. On the one hand, it claimed to be concerned about greater freedom and independence for sports organisations responding to reports of arguments by some of the more powerful governing bodies of sport who 'had begun to resent what they saw as the interference of government in their affairs', and who 'lobbied for a buffer to remove decisions from the political

arena' (72). On the other hand, it brought the administration of sport under greater control through the technique of obtaining a Royal Charter which formally confirmed the responsibility of the Sports Council to the Government. Indeed, the Conservative intervention in sport far from giving greater independence to voluntary bodies seriously threatened their autonomy as a federal group, in that under the direction of a Conservative Minister for Sport, Eldon Griffiths, the Sports Council virtually took over and absorbed the C.C.P.R. in all but name.

The decision to seek from the Queen a Royal Charter for the establishment of an independent Sports Council was justified by Griffiths on four counts: the enhancement of its status, a widening of its responsibility, its independence from Government, and the appointment of an independent Chairman (73). The proposal, was to amalgamate the Sports Council and C.C.P.R. whose full time staff were already engaged in Regional Sports Council duties (74). The Conservative Government's justification was prefaced with the rhetoric that this change was being implemented because of a recognition that sport and physical recreation in all their aspects were assuming an increasingly bigger dimension in our national life, and that in the forefront of their minds was one single question, 'what is best for sport'. It also underlined that it was by giving sport more responsibilities, executive powers and additional money, simultaneously giving it more freedom from government than had prevailed under Labour. The Conservative ideology of 'freedom' and 'individualism' was thus applied to the administration of sport. As Eldon Griffiths pointed out, 'the central point of the Government's decision is that the Government will no longer make decisions' (75). His argument for separating the running of sport from government was an economic one, in declaring that,

it is wrong to muzzle the voice of sport by putting in the chair a ministerial person who has a total responsibility to curtail central expenditure (76).

However, it was also a political one, which quite clearly indicated that sports organisations should keep out of political issues, for Eldon Griffiths unequivocally asserted that,

it must be wrong to ask a body like the Sports Council, which is expert in the field of sport and appointed for its expertise in that field to offer opinion about racial problems, about international affairs or public order in this country (77).

And although P. Noel-Baker took issue with this, pointing out that racial and political questions are dealt with by the international federations of sport and were not government decisions, the Minister repeated that Government would reserve to itself the total position.

Furthermore, although the Conservative Government presented the case for an executive Sports Council on the grounds of its independence, it brought sport firmly and legally under state control in writing in to the Royal Charter the responsibility of the Council the Government. This responsibility was specified in the following ways: through control given to the Secretary of State over judging whether the new body was representative of sport and physical recreation as a whole (78); through giving general guidance on the policy of Government (79); through the appointment of the Chairman, vice-chairman and other members of the Council (80); and through the appointment of any officer of his Department as assessor with powers to attend any meeting of the Council Committee or Panel (81). The executive of the C.C.P.R. was, in effect, persuaded to co-operate in its own organisational demise, and to concentrate instead on negotiating certain safeguards for the future of staff and survival of its work in some form. Indeed, the Executive Committee of the Central Council at its meeting on 9th July, 1971 accepted in principle

the Government's invitation to go into voluntary liquidation and to transfer its assets, staff and responsibilities to the new Sports Council (82). The proposal of the Minister (83) was that the C.C.P.R. voice should 'live on' in the form of a new self-elected conference of governing bodies of sport and other recreational organisations alongside the Sports Council. Yet, any nominations to the Sports Council (the Government's grant aiding body) were to be chosen by the Secretary of State (84).

The protracted deliberations of the joint Working Party of the C.C.P.R. and Department of Environment looking at the detail of the merger were rather upset, however, by the intervention of H.R.H. Prince Philip, President of the C.C.P.R., who argued at the A.G.M. on 4th November, 1971 for keeping a remnant of the C.C.P.R. in existence. His stand revealed the positions and the complexity of the situation which had developed. However, the Conservative Government 1970-74 in its action to amalgamate the Sports Council and C.C.P.R. cannot be regarded as the sole instigator in bringing sport closer into the hand of state control or usurping the C.C.P.R. independence. This had been set in motion in 1965 with the decision of the C.C.P.R. executive to accede to the request of the Labour Government - through Denis Howell to second the C.C.P.R. General Secretary Walter Winterbottom to the Sports Council, and in 1966 to set up Regional Councils with the C.C.P.R. as secretariat. The C.C.P.R.'s close identification with the Sports Council had thus, by 1972, become established (85), and made the situation very different from the attempt to absorb the C.C.R.P.T. in 1937 with the emergence of the Ministry of Education's National Fitness Council - which was met with vigorous and successful resistance.

It is important, however, to see the re-organisation of the co-ordinating national bodies for sport and recreation in a wider

context, for what is notable about the 1970-74 Conservative Government's approach is that in contrast to the 'holding operation' of Lord Hailsham in the early 1960s, it adopted a moderate but significant expansionist policy. Indeed, it encouraged the growth of participation in sport through a limited increase in provision and was supportive of the shift which took place in official policy from meeting demand to promoting sport as a desirable social concept. Both the Sports Council (1972-74) and the House of Lords Select Committee on Sport and Leisure (1973) adopted the position that provision for sport and recreation was a 'fundamental human need' and that it should be seen as an 'aspect of social welfare'. The Sports Council in 1972 launched a campaign entitled 'Sport for All' with the theme that the need for sport was inherent in human nature, but also indicated that in essence it was about arousing a new consciousness in government and local authorities of the value of sport to the community and obtaining more and better facilities (86). The House of Lords Committee on Sport and Leisure expressed the view that the provision of opportunities for the enjoyment of leisure was part of the general fabric of the social services (87). As McIntosh and Charlton point out, some qualified acceptance of this was given by the Minister of Sport in 1972 in stating that the provision of sport and recreational opportunities was almost as important to the well-being of the community as good housing, hospitals and schools (88). But this had a deeper political meaning. The Sports Council itself recognised that its promotion of the development of sport and physical recreation had to be seen against the background of the country's economic and social condition, and referred in 1973-74 to the increasing emphasis of central government on urban problems drawing attention to the range of schemes like urban aid programmes and educational priority areas, and itemising initiatives in recreation policy like studies in Sunderland, Oldham and Rotherham and the 'Quality of Life' experiments in Stoke and Sunderland as providing

scope for action and pointers to future prospects (89). Indeed, the Sports Council's response appeared to be a pragmatic and opportunistic one, identifying with the welfare and social objectives and defining the way ahead in terms of improvements in organisation and more sophisticated research advice (90). One of the outcomes of their consultation and discussion with selected planners, sociologists and economists in 1973 was the confirmation of a focus on understanding better the nature and distribution of recreation opportunities of towns and countryside - by concentrating on the recreational priority areas in the poorer parts of cities (first conceptualised in the House of Lords Report on Sport and Leisure) and the 'round-the-corner' centres (91).

Hargreaves (1985) interprets the welfare approach as a strategy to legitimise the political hegemony of social democracy which rested on governments being able to provide greater equality of opportunity, achieve a degree of cultural democratisation and create a sense of community (92). In this task the 'Sport for All' campaign and the focus on 'recreational priority areas' in the early 1970s can be seen as fulfilling a political function. Coalter et al. (1986) point to a widespread re-appraisal of the role and effectiveness of a broad range of public services with Plowden (education) Seebohm (personal social services) and Milner-Holland (housing) focusing on the deficiencies in welfare provision and leading to a growing concern with 'urban deprivation' and the quality of life in inner cities - Sports Council policies tending to replicate the twin themes of differential opportunity and social instability (93). However, it is also necessary to note that although there was a strong rhetoric towards welfare and mass recreational participation by the Sports Council, the grant-in-aid in the 1970s was weighted in favour of elitism - through direct grants to governing bodies, National Sports Centres or national facilities.

As Slater (1984) indicates, in 1973-74 direct grants to the governing bodies represented 15% of the Council's resources (£765,000) while in 1983/84 it represented 20% (£5.3 million) (94). Nevertheless, the continued support by the Sports Council in the 1970s towards the development of a local authority recreation service led to a massive increase in spending on provision in the public sector (95).

The 1970-74 Conservative Government thus presided over a policy for sport and recreation which had a marked effect on the structure of sports administration both at national level in the establishment of an executive Sports Council and at local level - though less directly - in the proposals of the House of Lords Select Committee on sport and leisure for the establishment of Recreation Departments with their own Chief Officers. It also gave some support to the advancement of welfare policies for sport and recreation in the context of increasing concerns about the deprivation and instability of urban areas. But Coalter et al. argue that in the period of the A.S.C. and the pre-1975 Sports Council although both the significance of success in international competition, and participation in sport as a right of citizenship were recognised, the areas were not regarded as being of political importance by government. They point out that the administration of the governing bodies was regarded as a pluralist area which, while benefiting from state assistance, was not seen as an appropriate area for state direction, and that government policy in regard to mass participation amounted to little more than a formal commitment to a vague slogan of 'Sport for All'. They further maintain that the issues were addressed in an a-political manner being concerned with resource maximisation, technical design, standards for provision and the nature of recreational demand, and that in such circumstances responsibility could properly (or safely) be left to independent 'experts' (96). They state:

The Sports Council occupied a technical and administrative space and could act as honest broker between governing bodies, government and local authorities. The independence of the council was secured because it operated within a policy vacuum (97).

This appears to have been the case in practice particularly until 1972. However, the Conservative Government's action in bringing about changes in the administration of sport through a Royal Charter which defined the limitations of the Sports Council's independence was an important turning point in structural terms. By constitutionally confirming the interest of Departments of Government in matters relating to sport and recreation, and requiring the Sports Council to formulate its policies with regard to any general statements issued from time to time by the Secretary of State, the terms were set for intervention, even if in the period up to 1975 this was not effectively implemented. Furthermore, it is worth noting the point made by Gramsci in Prison Notebooks that social crisis is not an immediate event but a process which can span a lengthy period (98). In the context of the state's interest in sport and recreation and the influence on the autonomy of the latter, this can be seen to be a gradually changing relationship from the late 19th century which the State Departments and Ministers helped to reconstruct in such a way that when it became evident - as indicated in the House of Lords Report on Sport and Leisure (1973) - that a range of sports might serve a useful purpose in urban social policy the mechanism for government to restrict the independence of the national administration of sport was already in place through its control over the Sports Council. And yet it can be said that 1975 represented an important landmark with a number of economic, social and political factors coming together at national and international level.

The oil crisis and the capitalist crisis of 1973/74 presented the incoming Labour Government in 1974 with a political crisis in terms

of how to maintain its traditional welfare statism within a declining economy, and its response was of a dual nature. On the one hand, it was concerned to cut back on public sector spending, but at the same time it needed to be seen to be making some provision for the more conspicuous casualties of the inner-cities. This dichotomy became evident in the White Paper on Sport and Recreation (1975) which expressed both revisionist and welfare ideological positions. It argued that recreation should not be exempted from financial constraints that may be necessary to impose in the light of the developing economic situation, and indicated that it had become clear that for some years to come local authorities may be obliged to spend less in total on a number of services including sport and recreation than in the recent past. The 'immediate needs' that the proposals in the White Paper were 'primarily directed' towards focused on the economic rationalisation of restraint - a tightening up of organisational arrangements to ensure the most efficient use of existing facilities and setting priorities for any limited new provision. At the same time official government concern was declared about recreational deprivation, its association with a conjuncture of other forms of social and environmental deprivation and its scope for reducing social tensions in inner cities. The penultimate paragraph of the report encapsulates the fusion of social problems and economic costs. This states:

The social stresses on many young people today are enormous, especially in the big cities. If we delay too long in tackling the causes of these stresses constructively, the problems which arise from them will be magnified, and the cost of dealing with their results greatly increased. The need to provide for people to make the best of their leisure must be seen in this context, and in the division of resources this requirement must also be balanced with the needs of traditional social services, housing and education (99).

The practical application of these aims was based on the strategy of regional and structure planning. The message to governing bodies of sport and physical recreation from the Labour Government was twofold. It recognised the wide variety of organisation in governing bodies of sport and indicated its hope that they would long thrive as independent bodies, but it also stressed the importance of a co-ordinated approach to common problems. Indeed, the White Paper was significant for establishing a new regional machinery modelled on the Regional Sports Councils but extending links to countryside recreation. These became known as "Regional Councils of Sport and Recreation". It was envisaged that they would act in an advisory capacity to the Countryside Commission as well as the Sports Council on broad regional priorities for grant-aid in respect of recreational facilities and services; that they would be specifically encouraged to promote the preparation of regional recreational strategies so as to provide an agreed framework within which recreational proposals in structure and local plans could be developed; and that they would be able, on request, to supply information to the Minister of State for Sport and Recreation to assist him in carrying out his broad co-ordinating role at the national level (100).

This was essentially a bureaucratic conception of politics. It attempted to mobilise a variety of organisations in sport, recreation, conservation, farming and forestry, and to increase the communication between broad diverse areas of sport and recreation and the state apparatus; but it had no conception of empowering people who engaged in recreational pursuits. Stuart Hall criticises the traditional Labour Party statist approach on Fabian lines as a passive notion of politics which relies on 'the masses hijacking the experts into power, and then the experts doing something for the masses: later ... much later' (101). Hall is arguing in the late 1980s for the deepening of

democratic life in a renewal of the socialist project, but his comments are apt in assessing the Labour-led policies of the mid to late 1970s which were then largely based on the 'economic-corporate, incremental Keynesian game'. Although it might have been necessary to mobilise the agencies of sport at a regional level as a means of developing strategic planning, the Labour Party programme for Sport and Recreation in the 1970s did not operate on the notion of politics as being about expanding popular capacities of ordinary people to run things themselves (the third political position characterised in the introduction to the Chapter).

Although it has been held by Torkildsen that recreation had come to be conceived as fun and enjoyment by the 1970s, as distinct from health and character (102), the White Paper's rhetoric is clearly instrumental. The benefits of vigorous physical exercise and active recreation are presented in terms of 'survival' and a reduction of the incidence of coronary heart disease; of reduction of hooliganism and delinquency; and a raising of morale through international success. These statements are as overt and politically motivated as those expressed by politicians and administrators in the 1930s and demonstrate the continuation of a theme of sport and recreation serving as a palliative for economic and social problems. Benefits to the state appear to be conceived in terms of alleviating demands on the welfare system through preventative medicine and through ameliorating the social disorders of capitalist society. Although these goals could be seen as consistent with deomocratic socialism, in practice they were developed on liberal and Fabian lines.

Annual reports of the Sports Council confirm the stringent approaches to spending during the 1975 to 1979 period. The 1976-77 document (103) reported that a series of Departmental circulars set out

Government policy to reduce local government expenditure and to introduce cash limits for future pay and price increases. In the following year a White Paper on the public expenditure survey planned a reduction in spending on environmental services up to the year 1979-80.

It is not really surprising that such constraints should be passed on to national agencies funded by the state when particular governments find themselves in trouble. It serves to underline how much sport and recreation - particularly the minor spectator divisions - are placed within a framework imposed by the state. That inner-city projects for sport managed to enjoy only moderate restrictions, and indeed obtain extra funding for special tasks (104), such as the Football in the Community scheme, indicates that it was perceived to have useful purposes to play at a time of recession. Indeed, it is notable that local government spending on leisure has continued to increase (105).

The opportunist tendencies of the Sports Council meant that it looked to whatever source it could for financial support. It continued to seek increased public funding with a bid for a large increase from £12.5 million to £20.5 million in 1979 (106); it also made particular mention of links with business. Indeed, the Sports Council's plans for the 1980s were grounded in the belief that the private/commercial sectors must be brought more closely into the overall provision for sport facilities. The incoming Conservative government in May, 1979 clearly influenced and reinforced this approach restricting public support and shifting the quest for funding in the direction of private and commercial business. Speaking to the House of Commons debate on 'Leisure, Sport and the Arts' on 25th January, 1980, Hector Munro, who replaced Denis Howell as Minister for Sport, stated:

The Government had found it necessary to limit public investment in Sport and the Arts. Economic growth comes first and support will depend on this ... but the Government would give every support and encouragement to commercial investment and sponsorship in Sport and Recreation (107).

The ideal of good practice promoted by the Sports Council now shifted from local authorities alone to consortia which combined statutory, commercial and voluntary resources. An example held up is the co-operation with Mecca Ltd., a subsidiary of Grand Metropolitan Ltd in the continuance of Streatham Ice Rink as a community sports facility and as a training area for elite skaters (108). A Working Party was also established by the Sports Council in 1980 to consider ways and means of attracting new initiatives from the commercial world (109). David Bacon's report Sport and Taxation commissioned by the Council was acknowledged to be the basis for a long series of discussions by the working party; it is also reported to have formed the basis of a seminar bringing together representatives of selected firms to discuss co-operation between the private and public sectors (110).

Monetarism, privatisation and the radical right alternative of the Conservative Government formed a backcloth to sports administration, and some of these values percolated through to sport, though without entirely converting the leading Sports Council's figures where there was an attitude of opportunism and strategy of 'sailing before the wind'. But in Government policy there was an emphasis on the return of the profitable sectors of public industry to private ownership and this marked a break from the social democratic form of government of the early 1970s. Corporatist bargaining between business, labour and government with the disciplining of the working class through incomes policies was replaced by a new kind of discipline

- a discipline imposed through unemployment and anti-trade union legislation. However the opportunistic approach actually served to mask the consequences of recession and thus provide support for conservative policies in three ways:

- (i) It helped promote the ideology of privatisation and a market approach.
- (ii) It perpetuated an acceptance of the range of unemployment and sought to make provision for the unemployed in a so-called leisure context.
- (iii) It helped divert attention from the social inequalities and distress of the times through generally increasing participation and promoting international competition and display.

To take the first point, the market ethos which pervaded the Sports Council's thinking was expressed in its policy objectives for the 1980s in terms of effectiveness, efficiency and economy (111). In practice a number of developments followed. A payment by results system was advocated for top coaches. If they did not produce the goods of turning out champions they were to be dismissed (112). It would also appear that Conservative Party supporters have been appointed to influential positions in the Sports Council - for instance Ian McCallum as Vice Chairman in 1980-81, Colin Moynihan, Conservative M.P. as a member in 1982-83, and Old Etonian, James Harvie-Watt, also as Vice-Chairman, in 1985. Indeed, Minister for Sport (1982-86), Neil Macfarlane indicated that, 'undeniably there have been instances of political appointments' (113). In addition, it is held that a close scrutiny of reports and documents produced by full-time staff has been made with questions of a political kind being raised (114). With the Minister of Sport and the Chairman and Vice-Chairman pro Conservative and the new appointment of John Wheatley - a management theory advoca

- as Director, the Council power elite were in tune with the Thatcher Government policies. The two top managers of the Council until 1982-83 Emlyn Jones and John Coghlan were reportedly forced into early retirement against their wishes, and this appears to be connected to the dictates of the strengthening Conservative influence.

Further, the Council adopted an aggressive approach to bidding for funds in the 1980s - as outlined in Chapter One - setting targets for increased participation, establishing a strategy of demonstrating 'value for money', as well as bringing in specialists from industry and universities to show how to market Sports Centres. In 1981-82 the Sports Council and Central Council of Physical Recreation also co-operated in setting up a sports sponsorship advisory service aiming to effect successful marriages between sport and business firms (115). The Sports Council was clearly concerned to widen the range of partners with whom it worked and especially in the commercial sector (116).

Secondly, it perpetuated an acceptance of unemployment. In the Sports Council's document Sport and the Community: the Next Ten years, the structure of employment is analysed in terms of technological change, mechanisation and automation, leading to a decline in manufacturing industry, a reduction in manpower needs and a likely net fall in jobs available during the remainder of the decade. Drawing on the Henley Centre for Forecasting it predicts that unemployment will grow and that this trend is endemic. Although the chronic elements are regretted, this rapidly passes on to the opportunities that are thus provided for sport. Unemployment from conventional work is seen positively as releasing a supply of people with skills to run sport and leisure schemes (117). The Council made a case for government funding for its role in this context. The deteriorating situation in unemployment in the 1981-82 period produced

a re-consideration of strategy. Emphasis was laid on the problems caused by social unrest in the inner cities and a conviction expressed that sport and recreation could make its contribution in alleviating these social problems. The Sports Council responded by the allocation of £3 million for an Action Sport Scheme in London and the West Midlands for the period 1982-85 designed to put leaders on the streets in deprived areas, and attract the unemployed, unattached, and uncommitted into taking part in sport (118).

Thirdly, provision for mass participation and elite performance not only assisted in the diversion of attention from social inequalities, but gave the impression that it was helping to overcome them. The Sports Council openly admitted in its 1981-82 Annual Report that hitherto its grant-in-aid arrangements had undoubtedly been weighted in favour of the elite in sport - through grant-aid to governing bodies of sport, running costs of National Sports Centres and other national facilities; but now declared a shift in emphasis to mass participation (119). However, this change would seem to be the result of a concern with the plight of the deprived and more with a strategic response to the economic and political situation - an adaptation which fitted in with the party political initiatives of the Thatcher government.

Following the Toxteth riots in 1981 the Secretary of State, Michael Heseltine, confirmed that one million pounds for sports facilities would be made available from Government, but on the condition that it would be matched pound-for-pound from private or voluntary sources - stating his view that in times of high unemployment the availability of local sporting and leisure facilities is important (120). The Sports Council was asked and took on the task of both raising the extra one-million pounds and ensuring that the

million was spent productively before March, 1983. In the words of the Secretary of State for the Environment:

Through the skill of the Sports Council who are acting for me on this initiative, the funds are being directed to those target groups and areas most in need (121).

The appearance of social conscience was thus made through sporting provision whilst at the same time policies of de-industrialisation were being pursued entailing high unemployment. In reality, sport was being promoted by government to contain the political effects of a particularly depressed area where no long term investment appeared to have been concentrated. In this pound-for-pound scheme sport was also being directed by the state towards the promotion of values of 'self help', 'voluntarism', and 'private financing'.

During the period of the two terms of Thatcher Government - 1979-83 and 1983-87 - the statist approach to sports provision has been strengthened and the influence of voluntary bodies reduced. At the same time tensions remain within the organisational system of two national forums for sport - a quasi governmental organisation in the Sports Council and a collective body for governing bodies in the C.C.P.R. The Sports Council's role as an appropriate vehicle for awarding government grants to sports bodies has been confirmed by the report of the all-party select committee of the House of Commons under the Chairmanship of former Social Services Minister, Sir Hugh Rossi (1986). This committee also 'saw no significant role for the C.C.P.R. other than to represent the collective views of governing bodies' (122). The process of the Sports Council absorbing the C.C.P.R. had not been achieved by the 1980s, and indeed the relationship between the two bodies has been one of increasing friction and rivalry. The essence of their different positions is that the C.C.P.R. see

themselves as the democratic voice of sport and they regard the Sports Council as an organisation devised by politicians for politicians. A major issue of contention has been in the contractual arrangement for funding of the C.C.P.R. by Sports Council grant - the Heads of Agreement contract contained in the formation of the executive Sports Council in 1972 which involved the Sports Council in making resources and facilities available to the C.C.P.R. as may reasonably be required. In the 1980s the C.C.P.R. grant increased from £179,194 (financial year ending 30 November, 1983) to £248,869 (1983-84) with a bid for over £600,000 (1984-85) (123). The C.C.P.R. have subsequently proposed the termination of the financial contract at a price of £10 million. Negotiations on this issue still continued in 1987 (124).

An account of the problems of the administrative system for sport and recreation in Britain, and the relative merits of Government Departments, the Sports Council, the C.C.P.R. and local authorities, is provided by the Minister for Sport (1982-85), Neil Macfarlane, in his book, The Politics of Sport (1986). His interpretation of statements by a range of organisations is that the Sports Council as a quango should remain as a grant-awarding body, and that this role could not as well performed by government departments or local government authority. He sees the Sports Council, however, as 'undergoing an evolutionary if not revolutionary change' in which they need to 'raise their profile within the framework of national and local government'. He confirms that the leadership and direction of the Sports Council should be business oriented. Commenting on the controversial departure of Dick Jeeps as Chairman of the Sports Council in April, 1985, he states:

I suspect that Jeeps himself felt he was being overtaken by a more commercial approach to sport (125).

Macfarlane also reflects the narrow view of politics, pointing out that it should be left to the elected representatives in the House of Commons. He critically attacks the C.C.P.R. for political action in expressing serious concern at the damaging consequences to London sport and recreation if the G.L.C. was abolished without an effective alternative, and calling upon the Prime Minister to establish a committee of inquiry. His position is that 'there is a requirement for strong national and local government involvement in sport', but his actions reveal the way in which sport is focused on displacing social problems which have other root causes. He also reveals in the following statement the sensitivity of Sports Council members towards the increasing ministerial influence:

The Minister for Sport ... if he chooses can, as I did, urge the Sports Council to concentrate on building sports facilities and to work alongside local authorities in order to reduce the tensions and problems in the cities and towns. The presence of all Sports Council meetings of a departmental official does give the Minister of the day an insight into the dialogue of the Council members and some of the members resented this 'deep throat' presence (126).

It appears that the Select Committee of the House of Commons and the Association of District Councils along with the Minister for Sport were supportive of the status quo, and that the role of the Sports Council was reinforced in the context of a commercial and business oriented approach which was in accord with the entrepreneurial and authoritarian Thatcherist ideological thrust. However, it is also evident that the influence of the government though increasingly more directive was not implemented in a simple or uni-directional way. Indeed, Government Departments take different stances on provision for sport and recreation. Macfarlane expresses his frustration at the lack of co-operation between the Department of the Environment on the matter

of dual use of public facilities; and despite exhortation by the DOE/Sports Council over a number of years, Education has resisted the attempts of Recreation interests in gaining access to shared use of schools (127) (this issue is addressed in more detail in Chapter Four). In addition, the efforts of the Prime Minister and successive Ministers for Sport have been insufficient to bring about changes in, for example, the Football Association and the Football League on the introduction of club membership cards as a condition of entry to League football grounds in response to violence of football supporters in 1985 - particularly the Heysel Stadium, Belgian disaster and the involvement of Liverpool F.C. supporters (128).

Nevertheless, although factions clearly exist within the Conservative Government on sports matters and in sports organisations, there has been a remarkable unity about the way the political imagination has been constructed around the themes of 'enterprise' and 'choice' in sport as in other areas of life. There may be divisions at an institutional and personal level, but both the Sports Council and C.C.P.R., for instance, have shown a similarity of approach in the 1980s in their identification with - 'market', 'entrepreneurial' and 'competitive' values which have contributed symbolically to the ideological work of Thatcherism's political project. This goes beyond the political pragmatism and sensitivity to changing government policies shown by the Sports Council - as indicated by Director John Wheatley's comment 'we exist in a political environment which we would be foolish to ignore' (129). It refers more to the hegemony that has been built around the benefits which can be gained from sport and recreation. The strategy of the Sports Council in the mid-1980s has been concentrated on the implementation of a Corporate Plan which emphasises tighter business efficiency 'in marketing its activities to produce income from users and commercial sources', encouragement of those 'activities which will increase participation', development of

- 'the most needed facilities in particular areas', encouragement of governing bodies to 'market their sports energetically' and to 'develop excellence at all levels' as well as requiring them to 'adopt effective anti-doping regulations and procedures', and on making the best and most economic use of its national centres (130). The Central Council of Physical Recreation continues to present an image of connections with the British establishment and business. Royal figures like H.R.H. Prince Philip, H.R.H. Princess Anne and H.R.H. Princess Michael of Kent feature in its Annual Reports, and C.C.P.R. events are sponsored by business firms like Gleneagles Hotels, Moët and Chandon, Arthur Bell and Sons, Courage Ltd. and National Westminster Bank (131). At the same time it mounts criticism of the privatisation of school playing fields by some local authorities (132).

Blended into the accentuation of enterprise and authority in these organisations is the targeting of inner-cities for additional resources. The focus on areas of special need was part of the thrust of the Labour Government 1974-79 and was reflected in the White paper on Sport and Recreation (1975). In the late 1980s under a Conservative Government a major expansion of initiatives for inner-cities has been programmed (133). However, there is a significant difference in the way the political policies are defined and applied which convey ideological divisions. The Labour approach followed traditional welfare state lines of egalitarianism where the focus was on inequality and the disadvantaged - at least in its rhetoric. The responsibility for coping with urban problems rested with government, even though cutbacks in public sector spending were advocated. The Conservative approach of the Thatcher era has broken with the post-war welfare statism, replacing this with strong central state directives towards an enterprise culture which stresses self-reliance and personal initiative. The aim has been to encourage private sector participation (134). The success with which this market and

individualistic enterprise orientation has been promoted and internalised by a mass public is demonstrated by the electoral achievements of the Thatcher led Conservative Party in 1983 and 1987. Sport and Recreation has played a part in the construction of this 'social bloc' even though it is manifestly a multi-faceted area with some sports (like tennis and golf) clearly more developed on commercial and market lines, and with many diverse and competing interests. The prevailing dominant image in the 1980s has been the entrepreneurial one, and in this respect Mrs. Thatcher and her colleagues have appreciated much more than the Labour Party the strategic importance of this ideological area.

Government Versus Sport

At the same time as the ongoing and extended attempts to use sport for depoliticisation purposes, the state dramatically intervened in a more direct political way. It was at the national and international level that state involvement entered a new phase during 1979-80 with the attempts of the Thatcher administration to use sport as an instrument to achieve political ends. The issues of the invasion of Afghanistan by Russian troops and apartheid in South Africa made support for the Olympic Games of 1980, staged in the U.S.S.R. and sporting contact with South Africa focal points for state involvement in the government of sport. The disturbances at football grounds in British and European competitions have also been closely monitored by government and this has become part of its focus on law and order as an ideological prop for the populist authoritarian state.

The British Government's interference over the Olympics in particular created strong feelings amongst sports bodies, and indeed the public at large. The extent to which the Conservative Government

was prepared to go was revealed by the campaign to boycott the Games. This included various attempts of Prime Minister Thatcher to appeal to the British Olympic Association then directly to British athletes (135), a Hands Off Afghanistan Committee of M.P.s (136) and the setting up of a Foreign Affairs Select Committee to examine relevant evidence and responsible persons involved in British sport and prepare a Report for presentation to parliament (137). Besides appearing before the Commons Committee, B.O.A. officers were summoned to meet the Foreign Secretary, Lord Carrington, on four occasions - with senior Ministers Douglas Hurd and Michael Heseltine in attendance.

The established Church and the press followed this lead. The Archbishop of Canterbury, Dr. Robert Runcie, and the Bishop of Liverpool, the Rt. Rev. David Shepard, both condemned the proposals to take part (138) - the latter indeed called on the General Synod of the Church of England to pass a motion instructing British sports bodies and individual athletes to refuse to take part. Furthermore, Big Business began to withdraw offers of financial aid, promotion and sponsorship. The Olympic Appeal Council comprising over a hundred leading businessmen and industrialists, under the Chairmanship of Sir Anthony Tuke (Chairman of Barclays Bank Ltd.) announced that it would take no further part in raising money for the Appeal (139).

Despite this pressure there was strong resistance from the sports bodies - the British Olympic Association, the Sports Council, the Central Council of Physical Recreation and most Governing Bodies - together with the large majority of athletes (140). The British public also voted in favour of British athletes going to Moscow (141). That the British Olympic Association eventually sent a team of 326, testified to the strength of the sports movement's resistance and the supportive mood of the nation which was less concerned with the issue

of where the games were taking place or with the political morality of the hosts (Russia's invasion of Afghanistan) than with a non-political approach to sport and the continuity of its traditions. However, although the Government was effectively thwarted on this occasion the lengths to which it went to deter the sports bodies from competing in the place of their choice highlights a number of important points not only about the British state's interest in sport in the 1980s, but about the nature of politics in capitalist international enterprise.

Firstly, the alliance between America and Britain under the Carter and Thatcher administration is shown to be a close one in which America plays an increasingly significant - almost dominant - role in the partnership of the two Western capitalist powers. This was demonstrated in the intensity of the political pressure made by the U.S.A. and President Carter on the Olympic issue - the purpose being to force the U.S.S.R. to withdraw its troops from Afghanistan by a deadline fixed for February 20th, 1980. As the British Olympic Association Secretary recalled, the C.I.A. approached all the National Olympic Committees which were thought to be sympathetic to a boycott (142). President Carter also appointed a special envoy for the campaign, who visited the British Foreign Office on February 4th, 1980 and met the Labour Shadow Sports Minister, Denis Howell, on February 5th (143). A second visit in March was designed to put pressure on the B.O.A.

Mrs. Thatcher was the first Prime Minister to join President Carter who was said by Stephens and Legum in The Observer to be looking for a foreign policy and for re-election and took up the idea in the form of a proposal to move the Games from Moscow to some other site or

sites (144). Mrs. Thatcher responded with full support for an alternative games. Her representative Douglas Hurd, Minister of State at the Foreign Office, became Chairman of a meeting sponsored by Britain, the U.S.A., Australia and 12 other countries on March 17th, 1980 to discuss the alternative possibilities (145). In seeking to legitimise such an event to the international athletics bodies, Mr. Hurd is reported to have said:

we must go through rule book by rule book, sport by sport, federation by federation (146).

Mrs. Thatcher was reported to be clearly delighted by the response of the United States Olympic team to the request made by President Carter not to go to Moscow and in a television interview (15th April, 1980) stated:

that is a lead which other nations cannot ignore, and I hope that our own will reconsider their decision and perhaps change it (147).

That they did not, raises a second feature of the Olympic conflict - the apparent solidarity of the sports lobby against state and business interests. Whereas in America the sports bodies acceded to the requirements of the President, in Britain the power of the state was resisted and overcome. Why was this? What were the forces which were assembled to deny what has been shown to be an increasing power of the state in sport in the post-1960 period? Was the solidarity of sports bodies a temporary alliance of interests or a more deep-rooted bond? Were the motives of the various sports bodies similarly grounded? What were the costs of the victory? What implications did this struggle have for the meaning and future direction - short and long term - of sport and its relations with the state?

An important element in this confrontation was the authority of the Olympic movement. This was based on the international network of its organisation, the existence of an independent set of rules, a long standing tradition (at least in its formal statements) of adherence to the cause of sport over and against commercial and political influence, and the link with an educated liberal and conservative establishment (like Sir Dennis Follows, the Marquis of Exeter and Lord Killanin). As Charles Palmer, a member of the B.O.A. and Secretary General of the General Assembly of International Sports Organisations pointed out in The Guardian (February 11th, 1980),

I cannot see any change forthcoming in our position. We agree as members of the Olympic Movement to abide by a set of rules which are sometimes illogical. Once we depart from those rules we are in an impossible situation. If the International Olympic Committee are going to Moscow, then so are we (148).

The decision of the I.O.C. - from reported statements of their President, Lord Killanin - was influenced by the feeling against the pressure of the American Secretary of State, Cyrus Vance, on behalf of President Carter (149). However, the fact that the American U.S. Olympic Committee did not comply with this shows that the decision was open to the relative influence and persuasion of individual states and the national Olympic Associations. In the case of America, the issue of the threat of Soviet power is so ingrained in the political socialisation of the country that there is likely to have been a good deal of pressure - both internally through the predominant value system, and externally with the demands of the State Department - for the athletes to accord with President Carter's wishes. Although it was the case that the President of the United States Olympic Committee, Mr.

Robert Kane, publicly spoke out against a boycott it was also stated that no consultation was made by the State Department in the initial pronouncements of the intention to boycott the Games (150). It would seem that the decision was a 'fait accompli'; but also supported by prominent athletes like Mohammed Ali who acted as a special envoy for the President in Africa to enlist support for the boycott (151), and Herb Brooks, Coach of the United States Ice Hockey team, who was quoted as saying,

Yes, I am (for a boycott). So are our athletes. We are a democratic country. Our president, our government, our elected representatives had decided this and agreed we should boycott ... (152)

With Britain, the pressure was no less intense, and the Olympic Movement did not win without a tough struggle. It was, however, greatly assisted by the all-round support of sports bodies, individual athletes, trade unions and the public at large. The arguments put forward to support the British sports position included one, that the government had now shown a strong enough lead in condemning the U.S.S.R. with other sanctions outside of sport (153); two, that world sports federations had a higher authority than individual national governments; three, that sport could act as a unifying force - and if they did not go to Moscow the Soviet propaganda machine would make more capital; four, that individual athletes would be denied their rights of competing at the highest level; and five, that any alternative Games would be impossible to organise.

The Olympic boycott issue was a much bigger and wider matter than could be contained within the state controlled agency of the Sports Council. It was an affair of national debate fuelled by the international significance of Afghanistan and anti-Soviet pressure. But the very act of interference from Government seemed to produce

greater resistance once the initial stand had been made by the relatively more independent bodies of sport (Governing bodies, the British Olympic Association and the Central Council of Physical Recreation). However, what was also being asserted was the position that 'sport is above politics', and that sports bodies and individual athletes should be free to compete with whom they choose. In this respect although they rejected Government pressure they did not challenge the ideological basis of Thatcherism. Indeed, although on this particular issue key sports organisations and many athletes were at odds with the Prime Minister and her senior colleagues, they were at the same time exercising the freedom of choice which she has frequently been at pains to emphasise, but which was made more explicit by Government on the subject of apartheid and sporting contact with South Africa.

The question of sport in South Africa has had an increasing political significance for Commonwealth countries since the mid-1970s. Successive British Governments have become involved and a number of Governing bodies of sport and national competitors have been affected (154). This has been directly related to the international pressure against the practice of apartheid and the particular initiatives of the Heads of State of Australia, India and Canada who were largely responsible for a declaration in 1977 following a meeting at the Gleneagles Hotel in Scotland of the Commonwealth heads of Government. The meeting, attended by Britain's Prime Minister, James Callaghan, and Foreign Secretary, David Owen, agreed to,

vigorously combat the evil of apartheid by withholding any form of support for and by taking every practical step to discourage contact or competition by our nationals with sporting organisations, teams or sportsmen from South Africa ... (155)

This Commonwealth Statement on Apartheid in Sport, the Gleneagles agreement, was a policy statement rather than a formal or legally binding agreement and allowed individual Governments discretion on how they fulfilled these obligations. The interpretation of British Governments was ambivalent. They sought to actively discourage sporting contacts with South Africa, but would not countenance moving beyond that and take steps to prevent such links. Further, as Neil Macfarlane, Minister for Sport (1982-85), points out there were divisions between and within parties:

... while the Labour Party is wholly united in its policy towards South Africa (a condemnation of its racist system), there are deep divisions on the Conservative backbenches. During my four years as Minister for Sport, I detected a mood of change within the ranks of the Tory Party; some members who had been strongly anti-apartheid were murmuring that many sports in South Africa were genuinely multi-racial and that there should be an easing of the Government's interpretation of the Gleneagles Declaration (156).

Prime Minister, Margaret Thatcher, continued to formally support the Gleneagles Agreement when questioned on the matter (157). However, her action in 1986, at the time of the Commonwealth Games in Edinburgh, in resisting calls by other countries to impose economic sanctions on P.W. Botha's regime in South Africa led to 32 of 58 national teams boycotting the Games (158). This signified that her support for action against South Africa through sport, via the Gleneagles Agreement, was merely a convenient and minimalist position which gave the impression of solidarity with Commonwealth countries but wavered when put to the test of serious sanctions. Furthermore, it revealed contradictions in her political use of sport, in that whilst boycotts were considered appropriate for the Moscow Olympics they were claimed not to work when nations opted out of the Edinburgh Games (159). This apparent inconsistency was explained away by distinguishing between the

persuasion used by the British Government in 'urging' the British Olympic Association to boycott the Moscow Games, and the directives of Commonwealth politicians in 'commanding' their countries' competitors to stay away from Edinburgh (160). This may technically be the case, but the strength of that persuasion, as already indicated, was formidable.

Two main planks of the Thatcherist ideology were proclaimed in the issues surrounding the Moscow Olympics and sporting contact with South Africa: one, the importance of emphasising freedom and choice, and two, the authoritarian way in which the persuasion process is actually conducted. Mrs. Thatcher is reported by Neil Macfarlane to have stated in the House of Commons on 2nd March, 1982 following the rebel tour of cricketers to South Africa that,

We try to uphold the Gleneagles Agreement. That has to be done by persuasion. In the end, the decision is up to each of the persons concerned because they are in a free country (161).

Neil Macfarlane as Minister of Sport reiterated this position during debate in the House of Commons on sporting links with South Africa on 9th February 1983, pointing out that going beyond persuasion in discouraging sporting contacts with South Africa would be contrary to Britain's established traditions and rights of free movement. He argued that it was his practice to advise governing bodies and that it was for them and sports people to decide whether they accepted that advice. He emphasised that the Government took no sanctions against those governing bodies or individual sportsmen and women who chose not to accept his advice (162). However, such a posture was tantamount to acceding to at least the bridge-building approach of recognising the improvements in multi-racial sport advocated by Dick Jeeps, the Chairman of the Sports Council 1978-85, even though Macfarlane was

officially obliged to support the Government in its interpretations of the Gleneagles Agreement. An alternative view represented by the South African Council on Sport holds that only when the apartheid laws are formally repealed can truly non-racial sport take place, and the British Government seems not to have made much advance in bringing about this end (163). Although the Conservative Government was formally in opposition with Governing Bodies of Sport and sports people who continued to pursue sporting contact with South Africa, like the Rugby Football Union and a number of professional cricketers, this appears to have been more because it was politically expedient in terms of relationships with the Commonwealth countries. At the same time they were maintaining the neo-liberal values of Thatcherism.

Yet an authoritarian approach was also evident. With regard to the Moscow Olympics the extent of the Government's pressure included the Prime Minister's personal involvement, and the repeated efforts of the Foreign Office, whose appeals were backed up with financial inducement of £50 million to provide facilities for an alternative Games. On the question of South Africa while there was perhaps a less concerted campaign by Government, direct Ministerial action was apparent in the sudden resignation of the Chairman of the Sports Council, Dick Jeeps whose differences with the Minister of Sport, Neil Macfarlane, included the approach he had taken on South Africa. Macfarlane states:

My colleagues and I in the Department of the Environment believed that the attitude of the Chairman of the Sports Council ... should be 100 per cent in line with those of the Gleneagles Agreement ... but our contrasting views did lead to turbulent discussions ... the general impression throughout the Commonwealth was of a man, the leader of our Sports Council no less, by inference, not totally committed to implementing the Gleneagles Declaration (164).

Whilst this may seem like an authoritarian stance which could be justified in terms of an anti-apartheid position, it has to be seen against the limited approach of the Conservative Government in taking more effective measures against apartheid. In this respect Mrs. Thatcher's hardline and intransigent style in resisting economic sanctions against the South African Government in 1986 both signalled that sport appeared to be the token gesture in anti-apartheid measures, and also again made apparent to many sportsmen and women that important events in the sports calendar could be sacrificed for political reasons by a British Government.

Yet there were also divisions on South Africa within sport itself, which broadly embodied four standpoints and exemplifies the diversity of politics in sport. Firstly, there was the anti-apartheid moral stand by sports people who were concerned to protest against the racialism of the South African social system without regard for some personal costs. H.B. Toft, a former England Rugby captain and England selector, is reported by Michael Davie of The Observer to have had the courage of his convictions, in the late 1960s, when he appeared to have been the only member of the Rugby Football establishment publicly to oppose sporting links with South Africa (165). More recently, Graham Mourie, the New Zealand Rugby captain, refused to lead the All Blacks in South Africa in 1981 (166). Secondly, there was the anti-apartheid stance of no sporting contact which appears to have been taken because of the losses (financial and organisational) which would be likely to occur through the withdrawal of fixtures by Commonwealth countries if the Gleneagles Agreement was not endorsed. The Test and County Cricket Board's justification for the three year ban on rebel tourists from being considered for selection for England was that they had to protect the financial security of the first-class game in England in the face of pressure from, in particular, three members of

the International Cricket Conference, India, Pakistan and the West Indies (167). Thirdly, there was the support for the South African sporting bodies (governing bodies of sport, the South African Olympic Council and National Games Association) who sought change not by confrontation or isolation but by an evolution towards multi-racial sport. The aim here has been the resumption of sporting contact given acceptable progress in multi-racial sports events. This appears to be the position that Dick Jeeps supported. Other advocates included John Carlisle, M.P. for Luton West who formed a pressure group, 'Freedom in Sport' which has a branch in South Africa and receives money from individuals, companies and some sporting bodies with the objective of ending South Africa's sports isolation (168). Fourthly, there was the view that sporting contact was outside and above political matters. Bill Beaumont, former England Rugby captain, argues that although personally opposed to the policy of apartheid, the denial of the right to visit any country and to play against their sportsmen would be a denial of democracy (169). One-time rugby referee Denis Thatcher, husband of the Prime Minister of Britain, in support of the British Lions rugby tour to South Africa in 1980 stated:

We are a free people playing an
amateur game and we have got the
right to play where we like ...
as sure as hell we can play our
game in South Africa (170).

Of the governing bodies, the Rugby Football Union, in particular, has been reluctant to comply with the pressures of the Gleneagles Agreement, expressing a liberal and romantic caricature that moral and political views can be divorced from sport. However, it has become evident in the late 1980s, even to the Rugby authorities, that the repercussions of pursuing the line of playing where and with whom they choose can have a wider impact on other competitive sports.

The two-fold theme of 'freedom and control' has also been conspicuous in the relations between Government and football authorities over the matter of spectator violence by English supporters both at home and abroad. Macfarlane saw the behaviour and control of English fans as the greatest problem he encountered during his four years as Minister for Sport. Indeed, his failure to adequately find a solution has been reported as the reason for his ultimate resignation (171). Both he and the Prime Minister, Mrs. Thatcher, expressed their disenchantment with and disapproval of the Football League, the Football Association and U.E.F.A., the governing body in Europe (172). But the matter of disorder at football grounds was not confined to the specific difficulties of sport. The first active involvement of the Prime Minister with the governing bodies of football, following apparent lenient decisions of an F.A. Appeals Board in 1985, was initiated because, as Macfarlane indicates, Mrs. Thatcher was 'most anxious about public order generally because the Miners' Strike was still on' (173). Pressure was placed on the Football League and F.A. to re-examine F.A. rules governing discipline and the responsibilities of clubs, and Mrs. Thatcher agreed to take action which included legislation to control the sale of alcohol at grounds and on transport to grounds, and the requirement of the Home Secretary, Leon Brittan, to encourage magistrates to make full use of their powers including detention and attendance centre sentences. These measures were reinforced and extended following the death of 39 people as a result of violence between Italians and English at the Juventus-Liverpool European Cup Final in the Heysel Stadium, Brussels. The Prime Minister responded to the incident and to media reactions which portrayed it as an internal discipline problem faced by British Government by treating it as a new crisis to manage, but one which channelled the public shock of the event towards a political interpretation. She is reported in The Observer to have summoned

sports writers who had witnessed the happenings, and at one stage told them:

There are three sources of violence
in our society: Ulster, football
hooliganism, and picket-line violence (174).

- thus broadening the issue, but failing to seek deeper social causes. Although the incidents of football hooliganism have undoubtedly been serious social matters, the way in which the problem has been defined as a question of law and order, rather than as 'a product of our class structure' (Eric Dunning, 1985) (175), makes political capital out of sport legitimising the intervention of Government at the highest level and gaining popular acceptance for this. However, at the same time, gaining practical support for the authoritarian policies at the level of football clubs has not been fully achieved. Mr Justice Popplewell who led the Committee of Inquiry into 'Crowd Safety and Control at Sports Grounds' set up by the Home Office reported that over 50 of the ninety-two league clubs failed to respond to his request for their considered views (176). The Conservative Government sees this as an indictment of English football, but it may also signify a lack of willingness to see the problem from other than an establishment position.

In appraising the role of the state in sport and recreation in the 1980s, it is apparent that intervention has occurred because sport has become significant - not in and for its own development, but in relation to the larger sphere of economic, political or cultural crisis. Media interest has brought sporting events on to the national and international stage and governments have capitalised on this for political ends. In Britain issues involving sport at an elite and mass level have been taken up and reinterpreted within an agenda that promotes the strategy of a Radical Right Conservative Government intent on appearing to roll back the state, but in reality of taking more central control of events.

Sport as a plurality of interests has been both involved in and has reacted to government intervention in contrasting ways. It has shown unity and strength on some issues (the Olympics), and divergence on others (apartheid). Politically moral stands can be distinguished from expedient measures, and also from a non-political belief in the autonomy of sport. Major spectator sports like rugby, cricket and association football and major events like the Olympic Games and Commonwealth Games - all of which attract media coverage, are more prominent in this national political context than sports which are only able to draw small audiences in Britain, e.g. trampolining, volleyball, basketball, squash and gymnastics - the sports of the leisure centres. Yet these so-called 'major sports' have also been classified as 'the sport of the minority' - sports created by the white Western world during its confident imperialistic phase. As Mihir Bose points out,

there are a number of indigenous sports in most third world countries, sports patronised by the people, but generally ignored by the media and the establishment of the country. For them sport means the sports devised, and, in general, administered by the West (177).

In this respect, the idea that sport is above politics is exposed as a Western liberal ideological prop.

The limits on the British Sports Council to do other than support the Government's position has been made more apparent in the 1980s. In addition, the tendencies towards a diversity of political perspectives on sports issues, have actually strengthened the role of Government in defining the political parameters. At the same time the idiosyncratic traditions of some sports has made it more difficult for Government ministers to either understand or exert control. Sports bodies may have become more aware of the political ramifications of

'major sports events', but this seems not to have necessarily changed attitudes about racism or class oppression.

This chapter opened with a characterisation of political approaches in sport and an analysis of the Wolfenden debate on the role of the state in the development of sport. Like the Olympic crisis of 1980, the impetus for a state-aided structure for sport in 1960 was fired by Britain's performance at international level, and the subject of top competitive and elite sport continues to arouse media, public and governing body interest. But in the 1960s the discourse though quite extensive within sports organisations was confined to professional and specialist bodies. It was also limited to the politics of sport rather than mainstream politics of international significance involving the U.S.A. - and so it was easier for politicians to control.

There were other continuities. Just as in the late 1950s and early 1960s the Wolfenden Committee had exerted an influence of a liberal-humanist kind, so over the Olympic Games the amateur ethic of Olympism prevailed. Yet there were differences. It would not be enough to leave the analogy there - to regard the Olympic Movement as totally in harmony or imbued with a liberalism and amateurism which was not also linked with professional and commercial interests. Although state and business lost the particular battle over the Olympics against labour (unions and athletes) and establishment (top administrators), it did not mean that re-alignment would not take place after the event. Indeed, the policies adopted by the Sports Council from 1981 have brought about an even closer identification of sport with Government, both in the international setting - over apartheid in South Africa, and in domestic politics - over provision for sport in inner cities.

The paradox is that because of the growing commercial and professional influence in sport during the 1970s it had become, through media coverage, very important to proceed with the Games; not merely because of the morality of the matter, but because the consumption of sport was seen as a natural right - and this event a traditional entertainment which was somehow above politics, of whatever direction. In this respect, although Mrs. Thatcher had tried to co-opt sport, on this occasion it had proved resistant to government influence. However, it has also been stressed that state intervention is not a static affair but an ongoing and problematic historical process in which the structuring of changes in the administrative apparatus of sport is accompanied by a continually shifting process which has involved Ministers of State, sports administrators, local authorities and athletes. In the 1980s the ideological work of Thatcherism has also had a good measure of success in penetrating the institutions of sport, but this is still open to challenge.

It has been revealed how both Conservative and Labour governments brought sport under state control, but the mere fact of state intervention is not the fundamental point of this examination. The issue is to assess the shift in the balance of forces and how this benefits one group or class over another. In the period from the late-1950s there was a movement away from the dominance of education and concern with mass recreation to elite sport. Yet in the 1980s a return to a broader recreation emphasis is evident. However, this is now more an expression of a directive stance by the state with a clear political purpose. Whilst the Wolfenden Committee and the group of Labour politicians may have, in addition to the interest in international sport, been concerned to broaden the base and opportunities for the masses through a strong state supported Council they appeared not to foresee the dangers of a state directed Council. What has been

demonstrated in this Chapter is the influence of government policies on sport through such a Council - not just the controls of individual Ministers and their aspirations; but more significantly, the channelling of the social democratic revisionism of Labour and the monetarism and privatisation of the post-1979 Conservatives. However, the analysis of this structural position needs to be extended for a fuller understanding, and the following chapters on the Local State and Business aim to deepen the examination.

CHAPTER FOUR

LOCAL STATE, SPORT AND RECREATION

Although much of the debate and policy making in sport is conducted from the centre through government departments, the Sports Council, the Central Council of Physical Recreation and national governing bodies of sport, it is within local authorities that leisure and recreation has become more comprehensively developed as a welfare service and as a business since the 1960s. Indeed, the drive by government and its agencies in the 1960s for increased provision for sport had marked economic, ideological and political effects at the local level. Local government became heavily involved in capital investment in purpose-built facilities with the number of sports and leisure centres increasing from one in 1965 to more than 770 in 1983 (1). A recreation management profession has been constructed around the need - identified by government ministers and the Sports Council (2) - for organisational skills in operating these centres, transforming the ideological thrust of sport and recreation from a liberal and education orientation to a business and management focus. The influence of physical educationists on the administration of sport was clearly evident in the period from 1935 to 1965, but by the mid-1980s the local authority dominated Institute of Leisure and Amenity Management claimed to represent the interests of the administration of recreation (3).

In political terms, from 1964-74 both Labour and Conservative governments highlighted the importance of corporate management and planning for the local sector, emphasising both the need for greater internal administrative efficiency, and the increased capacity to

harmonise local communities in the wider context of economic pressures of Britain's declining performance in world markets and social stresses in inner cities. By the mid-1970s and a Labour government's return to power (1974-79) local sector provision was reinforced as an instrument to ameliorate the conflicts of urban areas. But also stressed was the need for economic constraints in public sector spending as the crisis in capital accumulation became more marked. The potential for using sport and recreation as a legitimacy mechanism may explain why in the explicit attack on the public sector in the Thatcher Conservative governments from 1979 the spending on local authority recreation was modestly increased. However, by the later 1980s with the intensification of new Right radicalism the way of achieving the social objectives of integrating communities, but simultaneously reducing public spending, was being addressed with some urgency with consequent effects on recreation provision and practice. Indeed, the Department of Environment in 1987, through its Secretary of State, Nicholas Ridley, placed direct pressure on local authorities to put services for sport and leisure out to competitive tender. A Department press release indicated that

The Government wants to extend the competitive tendering regime as quickly as possible. The management of sport and leisure facilities is an important activity, and exposing it to the test of competition will enable councils to achieve better value for money to the benefit of their communities (4).

Sport and recreation was in this way specifically included in the Thatcher-led entrepreneurial political project of the 1980s. Thus from 1965 to 1987 the political and ideological conjuncture in which sport and recreation was promoted at local level shifted - from increasing state investment under a corporate management and planning movement to an off-loading of state assets in the thrust towards a

more market-oriented, competitive and privatised society. However, the ways in which these broad trends have been interpreted and experienced within local institutions have varied according to the complexity of particular political and ideological forces. Account will therefore be taken of national policies within a range of local contexts, with particular attention being paid to the West Midlands metropolitan authorities.

The aim of this chapter is to provide a more detailed understanding of the corporate and market emphasis through an examination of the way in which sport and recreation was shaped by the different political and ideological conjunctures, and through an assessment of how far sport and recreation, particularly at the local level, contributed to the changing parameters. This has involved analysing why and how central policies in sport have been communicated to local authorities and expressed at local level, both with regard to the 'corporate' and 'market' movements. It was also entailed identifying and interpreting the divergent ideologies of sport and recreation and the political interplay between them in the organisation and practice of the apparently simple concepts of 'joint provision' and 'dual use' of facilities, which were consistently highlighted in official policy documents from the 1960s and 1980s. It has been necessary to critically consider the opposing political forces of free market conservatism and municipal socialism which emerged during the 1980s, and to assess their relevance for sport and recreation. In this context it has also been important to evaluate the significance of the enduring stress on 'community' in sport and recreation, and how this has been given specific meaning in the context of the changing political strategies.

The Corporate Movement, Planning and Management

This section addresses a number of questions about the local state in relation to the emphasis given by government to corporate management and planning in the 1960s and early 1970s, the period in which notable advances were made in facility provision for sport and recreation. The questions posed include the following: What was the corporate management and planning movement and why was it politically significant? What were the political objectives and how were these operationalised? How far did local authorities adopt corporate messages and practices? What part did sport and recreation play in this movement and with what effects?

Corporate management and planning in the state sector in Britain refers specifically to the internal management reforms of local authorities that were introduced by central government in the period from 1957 to 1974, and which along with the external structural reforms relating to the size and functional grouping of authorities amounted to a corporate movement based on a marriage of management and science derived from business and academic institutions (5). In terms of method, corporate management can be seen as a holistic approach to managing which involves focusing on the goals and strategies of a system, constructing a pattern of relationships for efficiency of information flow, defining channels of responsibility and accountability, and designing levels and sequencing of decision making processes (6). However, in itself the development of more efficient methods of management has little political and social significance. It is what corporate management means in terms of power and control in particular contexts that makes it socially and politically important. In this respect it is necessary to identify the purposes behind the application of

corporate management to local authorities from the late 1950s and early 1970s before addressing the part sports provision played. It is the economic and political factors which provide the key to this deeper understanding.

The analysis of Glyn and Sutcliffe (1972) offers some insight into the distinctive role of local government since 1948 through a focus on some of the significant features of the economy. They argue that public investment in the local sector was a rational decision of central government to resolve the crisis of falling profitability for capital brought about by international competition and increased wages of the work force (7). The attempts to overcome competition involved providing private capital with a market in the local sector, particularly in the building and construction industry. The boom in local government expenditure in the 1960s was indeed connected to the state's role in using public spending to support the changing requirements of capital, and as Benington points out, the local state acted to cushion the effects of market fluctuations of industries like construction (8). Given the important function of local government in performing economic objectives for the central state acting in the interests of capital, the efficiency of the local sector became of paramount concern to governments during the 1960s. The drive from the centre to bring about structural and organisational reforms on a massive scale indicates the political importance of the local sector. The Royal Commission on Local Government (1966-69) appointed under the chairmanship of Lord Redcliffe-Maud to consider the structure and functions of local government in England outside Greater London argued that the close involvement of national government in affairs of local government was inescapable because so much was asked of it, and because central government had also become dependent on local authorities (9).

However, the Commission's report was mainly presented in terms of a liberal progressive need for 'the highest possible level of management skill and technical efficiency' to meet the increased demands on local government from housing, education, health and welfare services (10). Although the purpose of local government was seen as providing a democratic means of focusing national attention on local problems, the Commission argued that local government must act in agreement with the national government when national interests are involved (11). As Cockburn points out, the system as a whole was being geared up to govern more intrusively and more effectively (12). Corporate management and planning indeed involved economic and political purposes in terms of securing greater co-ordination and central control of local authorities, which in turn had effects on interests like sport and recreation and public users of the services provided, which I shall attempt to show later in this section.

The corporatist approach involved both Labour and Conservative governments. Concerns about the reform of local government were expressed by the Conservative party in the late 1950s and early 1960s, then taken up by Labour 1964-70, and further developed by Conservatives in power 1970-74. However, the approach of Labour, in particular, is striking for the irony that corporate management and planning served to reinforce inequalities rather than to transfer power to the people. There was a tradition here in that a focus on efficient management in local government without increasing democracy was not a new phenomenon for the Labour party. As Beatrix Campbell and Martin Jacques point out, the London County Council (until 1963) and the Greater London Council (from 1963 to the late 1960s) embodied the image of well managed political administration associated with the grand old godfather of local government, Herbert Morrison, which became established in the 1940s and 50s. But although

the Morrisonian tradition produced at its best, well run services which Campbell and Jacques describe as being renowned throughout Britain and even internationally for a period, it failed to empower ordinary people (13). As Williams (1961), Benington (1976), Cockburn (1977), Hall (1984) and Campbell and Jacques (1986) all reason, Labour's Fabian and welfare state tradition of providing certain social benefits was continued in the corporate approaches of the 1960s and early 1970s, but in ways which reinforced the gap between dominant and subordinate groups (14). The interaction between working class citizens and the state was contradictory in that although people needed the resources provided by well-managed local authorities, the intensification of management principles increased the authoritarian and regulatory nature of those authorities thus limiting freedoms and reducing the control of individuals over their lives.

In the circumstances of financial crisis which began to envelop local government in the late 1960s, the application of corporate management and planning became emmeshed with government concerns to ameliorate the resulting breakdown in relationships between the local state and its communities. Campbell and Jacques indicate that in London, in particular, Labour's old relationship with its constituency began to fall apart in that period. They also state that

Disillusionment and unrest characterised the cities and was completely unrepresented by Labour. Indeed labour in local government was the problem for ordinary people in many cities (15).

Awareness of the problems and dangers of breakdown between local authorities and communities which contained disadvantaged groups was apparent in the Labour Government's focus on inner city areas, and

the statement by the Home Secretary, James Callaghan, in July 1968 on the need for special intervention by public agencies of all kinds if the manifestations of poverty were ever to be eradicated (16). An important government intervention at this time was the introduction of the first specifically inner-area programme known as 'urban-aid' which made provision for special financial assistance to designated local authorities (17). However, the question to be raised is whether the political response to economic crisis and social disintegration, of introducing organisational measures and financial targetting, was enough if the sources of inequality and the deepening of democracy - the real passage of power to the powerless - remained unaffected. In the sense that the development of local government administration and co-ordinating procedures were employed to identify and, to this limited extent, to assist in overcoming the problems of deprivation, corporate management served ideologically to harmonise working class and ethnic minorities in inner cities produced by capitalism in crisis.

However, the implementation of corporate management and planning in specific local authorities was not achieved in a uniform manner. As Cockburn points out, the putting into action of the management reforms was not a matter for dictation since local authorities had substantial control over their own internal working. The approach from the centre was one of persuasion affected through numerous government circulars urging the various new local bodies to adopt the management proposals although allowing different interpretations of detail (18). At the same time there were identifiable phases which were broadly similar in structure and intention, and which reflected the political and ideological shifts during the period from the early 1960s to the mid-1970s. Cockburn summarises these as a movement from simple measures of administrative

efficiency involving cost-saving and productivity-raising devices, to a mid-1960s switch to a concern with the local authority as an integrated whole reflecting the corporate-style recommendations of the Maud Committee on the Management of Local government which involved the establishment of a top-down approach of senior management teams under a chief executive (19). A third phase occurred in the late 1960s linked to the rediscovery of urban poverty with working class militancy in cities, as indicated in earlier paragraphs. In this conjuncture there was an application of management towards problems in the community rather than the earlier focus on internal aspects of organisation. As Cockburn states

The sights were raised: councils had to move from administration to government. They were being asked to solve problems out there in the communities (20).

In the 1970s there was a further phase which involved the development of greater links between government and business using the corporate approaches in local authorities and the corporate methods of business as a point of communication. A key group in the process of channelling management ideas and methods from the business world to local authorities were management consultants like McKinsey and Co. Inc. who had pioneered American management methods in British business and who exploited the market opening up in government - at central and local levels. Cockburn cites examples of this development indicating their influence on the armed forces, the National Health Service, gas, electricity, British Airways and the BBC as well as local authorities, but she also points out that the intermediary role between business and state organisations in encouraging corporate management was more characteristically played by leading members of the professions (21).

In summary, the essential dimensions of corporate management and planning in the 1960s and 1970s appeared to be as follows:

- (i) It was a centrally directed movement involving government departments and agencies, management consultants and academics which focused on local authorities.
- (ii) The underlying structural dimensions of this movement involved a political response to the economic crisis for British Industry of international competition in world markets and heavy demands for wage increases. This response sought to use the expansion of investment in the local sector to cope with the falling profitability for capital.
- (iii) It was also a movement which as it developed worked ideologically to create the impression of resolving social problems in urban areas through the application of efficiency in organisational methods in the interests of communities, but in so doing it served to maintain inequalities of class, gender and race.
- (iv) It involved both Conservative and Labour parties whose strategies were politically framed by the objective of upholding a social democratic consensus of power arrangements.
- (v) Business and state increasingly became fused as the movement developed in the 1970s under the initiatives of leading professional bodies.

The organisation of sport and recreation seems both to have assisted and been conditioned by this movement. It contributed to the hegemony of social democracy through corporate management and

planning, but it pragmatically sought to benefit from it. At the same time it brought about a change in the forms and language of sports administration. Indeed, the developments of provision for sport in local authorities in the late 1960s and 1970s provide a case study of how corporate management and planning operated, and seems to indicate how increasingly important the area of culture became in political and ideological terms for the state.

The cornerstone of corporate planning and management in sport and recreation was the centralist and top-down approach which set the pattern for policies for community provision from the mid-1960s to the present. This involved government departments - the Ministry of Housing and Local Government then Department of Environment, agencies like the Sports Council, and individual politicians and professionals. It was executed through official reports, practical developments such as the construction of leisure amenities on a nation-wide scale, the establishment and growth of management training and the creation of a 'new' profession of recreation management. The effect was to provide opportunities for those most able and skilled to enjoy the increased provision, but to underline the limitations of provision of amenities from above when the structural sources of inequality remained unaltered.

The planning strategy for sport was laid down in October 1968 with the establishment of a Working Party on 'Planning for Sport' set up by the Sports Council (22). The underlying thrust of this report was the need to concentrate on local authorities and to bring together resources for sport as efficiently as possible. It emphasised the importance of closer co-ordination between those who provided facilities - public authorities, voluntary bodies and

commercial agencies - and a greater measure of joint planning by statutory authorities and other organisations. In line with the Maud Report on 'The Management of Local Government' (1967) set up by The Ministry of Housing and Local Government, 'Planning for Sport' highlighted that the aim of the internal organisation of authorities should be to facilitate co-operation between departments responsible for the planning, financing and design of facilities. The Labour Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State with special responsibility for sport, Denis Howell, pointed out in the Foreword to the report, that the Working Party's aim had been to develop methods by which requirements could be assessed in the light of local needs and traditions and regional variations in the pattern of participation in different sports. It did not recommend national scales of provision for different sizes of population. In this respect, the Working Party cannot be said to have set out to impose nationally agreed scales of provision on local authorities. However, it did indicate how local authorities should be going about the task of providing for sport in terms of organisation, method and scale. In addition, it served to promote the emphasis of a Labour Government concerned to adopt a rational planning ideology. Howell indicated

I must emphasise that the report
is an exercise in planning - a
means of ensuring the rational
development of facilities (23).

The report also signifies other taken-for-granted value positions about the purpose of expanding facility provision.

'Planning for Sport' argued that the country's general provision for leisure included the wider aspects of social and physical planning, and the need for challenging and satisfying leisure pursuits was linked to changes in the physical and mental demands of work. Sport

was thus seen as connected to wider political and economic requirements. It was also implied that sport had a socially cohesive function for communities

Sport and physical recreation are essentially social activities; it is the friendship and companionship found in them which is their main attraction for many people. Provision for sport and recreation is thus a vital part of community life (24).

The understanding of the place of sport in communities, however, was conceptualised in relation to the supply of facilities for what was asserted to be a growing interest and demand for participation. The Working Party defined its task as considering how the needs of 'man at play' (sic) in an urban setting may be translated into terms of sports grounds, swimming pools, sports halls and other indoor facilities all provided as part of a coherent overall plan for a locality (25). This planning strategy for sport corresponded with the government's broader approach to development plans for urban areas and cannot be seen in isolation. The concern of the sports establishment was a 'bricks and mortar' objective - of increasing facility provision on a massive scale to redress the shortages and gaps identified in largely traditional sporting amenities. This was essentially a matter of resources, and indicates the 'collective consumption' orientation of producing commodities for an apparently more affluent society. Local authorities were seen as the most appropriate resource provider for sport and physical recreation because the costs were beyond voluntary initiatives, and because it was stated that many facilities would be unlikely to be viable commercially; but also because of their important planning role (26).

The planning and management thrust in sport and recreation was further reinforced from the centre through the appointment in 1971 of a Select Committee of the House of Lords chaired by Lord Cobham on 'Sport and Leisure'. Its terms of reference were to consider the demand for facilities for participation in sport to examine impediments in the use and development of facilities and to report on how these might be removed (27). The report published in 1973 characterised the corporate management/planning approach in several ways. It focused on local authority investment and administration, it underlined the importance of co-ordinated planning within a national supply-led mode of operation, it emphasised the need for the expansion of recreation management training and the 'training' of the public in the use of the countryside, and it argued that leisure must be regarded as a social service with compensatory treatment being recommended for deprived urban areas (28). In effect, although the report stated that the principal requirement was for local facilities, locally provided, so that they reflected local conditions and met the actual, not the imagined demands of local people, it was a centrally led 'top-down' approach which, through persuasion and recommendation from influential positions, attempted to create the conditions for an expansion in provision for sport and recreation. The deliberations of the Cobham Committee on 'Sport and Leisure' were indeed part of a wider campaign involving the Minister for Sport and the Sports Council to obtain an increase in facilities for sport and recreation. Although the evidence taken by the Committee was not explicitly 'promotional' nor the members of the Committee specifically representative of sports/recreation interests, the Report indicated an empathy with the work of the executive Sports Council, established in 1972, and its 'Sport for All' campaign. The Committee also appointed two Specialist Advisers - Professor Brian Rodgers and Professor Alan Patmore - who in turn became Sports Council

members and Chairmen of its Research panel. In addition, Denis Howell, Minister for Sport (1965-70) and (1974-79) was one of a handful of individuals (13 in total) who were 'called in and examined' by the Committee (Minutes of Proceedings of the Committee). 'Cobham' was distinctive in respect to the thrust for expanding provision for sport and appeared not to be a simple reflection of the mainstream corporate management movements. However, it sought to establish a local authority base for the development of sport just at the time of a major transformation in local government, and its campaign was pragmatically framed in the language of the dominant influences in government and the professions. So, although the Report was very much about provision for sport and recreation it progressed on the back of the corporate movement (29). Needs were defined in planning and management terms, and were centred on the social problems of inner urban areas. The Committee argued in its report that

Government assistance is called for ... to compensate for the shortcomings of the urban environment (shortage of open space, poor housing conditions, individual poverty) (30).

The Sports Council reiterated this compensatory theme, claiming that sport could integrate community life, bridge gaps between ethnic groups and cultures, and ameliorate social problems such as juvenile delinquency through the provision of 'the right kind of recreation facilities in our cities' (sic) (31). The planning and management of facilities was thus not about efficiency in a vacuum, but as the corporate movement got underway in the early to mid-1970s it became more clearly linked to the social and political purpose of containing the unrest in deprived urban areas. As indicated earlier the corporate movement - and sports provision and recreation planning and management as an aspect of this - performed the ideological function of appearing to resolve the problems of local communities.

Indeed, the belief in planning and in management techniques as the basis for confronting the problems of society became embedded as the dominant world view in the developing recreation profession from the late 1960s, within which sport was an important feature. The Sports council played a leading role in emphasising the importance of planning. They drew attention in their Annual Report 1972-73 to the legislation which had been introduced in 1968 for the new planning machinery and approach to planning problems. As they explained, the new plans consisted of two parts; a structure plan and local plans. Structure plans determined major elements of physical development and allied social and economic policies, and local plans were then constructed around the detail of local provision. Public participation was seen by the Sports council to be an inherent part of this planning process though this operated within the framework of central and regional guidelines. The Sports Council through its regional councils sought to be involved in the recreational element of structure plans, whilst it also supported the planning ideology through requiring its regional sports councils to engage in planning exercises for a ten-year programme concerning recreation facilities (32). Alongside the emphasis on a planning perspective management sciences were identified as the *necessary core for training, and universities and polytechnics* were encouraged to develop courses which could foster the skills and new appreciations required (33). The Sports Council and the government also joined the Planning for Sport Working Party (1968) and Cobham Committee (1973) in accentuating the importance of recreation management. The Sports Council took a lead in encouraging the exchange of information on management techniques through establishing an annual national conference of recreation management from 1969, and inaugurating an award scheme in 1975-76, sponsored by Nissen International (Sports Equipment) Ltd, 'to discover the best-managed sports centre in the United Kingdom' (34). The Government in the White Paper Sport and Recreation (1975) expressed its own concern 'to improve recreation

management with a view to the better use of resources' and the concern of employers (mainly local authorities) who saw 'a need for improvement of management and career prospects in the recreation field'. A study was subsequently set up under a Committee chaired by county Councillor Anne Yates by the Secretaries of State for the Environment and for Education and Science after consultation with local authority associations and other interested bodies, to assess the needs and opportunities for the training of recreation management and supervisory staff (35). (Further comment will be made about the Yates Committee deliberations during the Chapter). At this point it is emphasised that the planning and management thrust was not just about techniques but a resource issue primarily directed towards inner-urban areas in which recreational deprivation was seen by government to be associated with a conjuncture of 'other forms of social and environmental deprivation' (White Paper Sport and Recreation, 1975).

Research on the West Midlands region undertaken by the author between 1978 and 1984 provides a basis for evaluating how corporate planning and management was interpreted at local level. The overall impression drawn from this analysis is that the corporate approach of the 1960s and 1970s established a number of patterns in local authorities which served to strengthen the organisational and professional framework for leisure services, but simultaneously reinforced the powerlessness and disadvantage of working class youth, ethnic groups and women. Far from alleviating deprivation, the corporate movement appears to have maintained it through the centralist, 'top down' approach to planning, the pre-occupation with management methods, the concern with standardisation through structure plans, the identification of recreation needs in terms of gaps in provision, and the translation of social problems into technical terms.

The formation of Recreation Departments in local authorities during the 1970s - following the Cobham Report - can be seen as a corporate reform in itself, pulling into one integrated department previously separate divisions such as Baths, Parks, Museums, Art Galleries, Cemeteries and Allotments as well as the growing area of indoor sport. Torkildsen (1983), whose book Leisure and Recreation Management was the first of its kind in Britain, lists a number of factors which led to the trend towards larger and more comprehensive local authority recreation and leisure services departments:

- (i) Local government re-organisation with authorities reforming and grouping into larger bodies with greater stocks of recreation resources.
- (ii) The acceptance by many councils of the advantages of corporate management following recommendations of the Bains Report Study on the Local Authority Management Structure (1972).
- (iii) The establishment of new government agencies like the Sports Council and the Countryside Commission.
- (iv) Structure planning and corporate planning, which arose from the Planning Act (1971).
- (v) New types of facility such as *leisure centres, art centres and country parks*.
- (vi) The emergence of a new 'breed' of recreation professionals with an emphasis on comprehensive recreation management.
- (vii) Government reports and circulars encouraging links between major services (36).

The key point to make, however, is that at this crucial stage of sports development in the local sector during the 1970s, corporate trends fashioned a centrally directed and bureaucratic system which was legitimised on the basis of meeting 'community needs' but in practice failed to identify or respond to needs of the working class, ethnic minorities or women for greater control in their leisure

time. As a management consultant and recreation manager Torkildsen typifies the administrative approach in applauding the 'better general rationalisation and standardisation' for its improvement of recreation management, but shows a limited appreciation of the political and ideological significance of these developments.

By 1978, Leisure and Recreation Committees had been set up in six of the seven metropolitan boroughs of the West Midlands, and over half had developed a formal corporate management approach. It was also the case that the way this tended to operate for Recreation was from the top down focusing on large scale objectives prepared in detail by officers and submitted to councillors in draft form for their final confirmation (37). However, as Benington points out, the effect of this centralist approach has been to obscure the conflicts of interest which would be more apparent if the exercise of providing for communities began in the political process (38). According to Benington part of the explanation for the prevalence of the 'top down' modus operandi is that the reference point for local authority corporate planning and management approaches has been the business model which, in addition to the hierarchy of process sets a premium on structure plans, objective standards, identifying needs as gaps in provision and quantification (39). Examination of structure plans for the West Midlands which were constructed during the period 1974-78 confirms the inclination of local authorities to conceive of social needs for recreation in terms of the disparity between national and professional standards of facilities - mainly indoor, sports centres - and what existed locally. Whilst there may be a case in rational management terms to ensure a degree of co-ordination in provision of amenities, the tendency to treat conflicts of interest as neutral technical problems has led to concrete issues

being treated as isolated mistakes or deficiencies rather than questions of policy (40). The major common problem identified in the West Midlands structure plans related to inadequate provision of facilities. Dudley's plan stated that

the Borough is deficient in almost every kind of sports facility if the situation is judged solely by apparent demand and public opinion' (41).

Birmingham indicated that, the increase in intensity of housing development in certain parts of the city necessitated that close scrutiny be made of the provision of recreation and leisure facilities (42). Walsall listed a wide range of deficiencies in Urban Open Space and in Indoor Sports Facilities, and stated that 'the Local Sports Advisory Council have estimated that eight indoor sports centres are needed within the town' (43). In Wolverhampton's statement the principal problem was summarised as 'the increase in leisure time, combined with greater affluence and mobility, placing increasing pressures on recreational facilities' - particularly outdoor and indoor sports facilities (44).

However, within these statements there appeared to be little evidence of attempts to focus on disadvantaged groups. The purpose of the West Midlands plans seemed to have been more a means of setting targets to help rationalise and control the activities of various emerging departments. Indeed the Panel set up by and reporting to the Secretary of State for the Environment, Peter Shore, in 1976 noted that none of the six structure plans contained a framework of priorities for provision of central facilities to serve the wider community, and facilities intended for the use of local residents only (45). In this respect the broader regional co-ordinating role of the Panel and the West Midland Sports Council did have an impact in recommending to local authorities the need for

such a framework, and that a policy should be included in each plan to give authority to the provision of local recreational facilities in those areas most deprived of them. However, local councils interpreted such recommendations as it suited them and in relation to their priorities at the time.

Not all authorities took the same approach. Labour-controlled Walsall had indeed made explicit the decision to focus on local provision spread amongst neighbourhoods rather than large central facilities, and one of the stated reasons for this was to meet the needs of the less mobile and disadvantaged sections of the community (46). However, the tendency in these structure plans was to refer to gaps in provision: that is, the difference between existing provision of services and the standard set for that provision. In sport and recreation in the post school sector these standards were those devised by professional bodies like the National Playing Fields Association and the Sports Council (47). The notion of need seemed to be taken as a commonsense term requiring no theory about urban life.

It is true that the problem of standards did not altogether escape the scrutiny of planners and the Department of Environment's Panel, for they did not consider that the various standards for recreational provision suggested by outside bodies and by West Midlands County Council should be adopted uncritically. Indeed, they commented that

such standards, however useful as a general yardstick, may not offer the best means of providing adequate facilities for all groups in the population (48)

They were also critical of authorities like Dudley, West Bromwich and Wolverhampton who had used these standards as a minimum target (49). However, what the local authority plans and the Department of

Environment and Sports Council inspection and control failed to do was to identify groups of people who would stand to gain or lose most. Even where need was identified - as in Walsall - the categories of need tended to be broken down in terms of broad age bands - like the elderly, the pre-school child, or of specially vulnerable groups such as the disabled (50). Whilst this indicated the positive discriminatory thrust of that authority, the argument that it could obscure the range of diversity within the larger categories of the working class as well as the differences in need between people in different geographical areas needs to be taken into account.

Social problems also tended to be conceptualised in management as well as planning terms. One of the leading members of the Yates Committee, J.M. Munn - a former local authority Physical Education Adviser and Birmingham's Chief Recreation Officer from 1983, commenting in 1974 in relation to the use of schools as community centres said

Management is the key ... where managerial staff of the right calibre have been employed, all the domestic, caretaking and vandal problems associated with casual public use of schools have disappeared (51).

Whilst, the acquisition of management skills may indeed be useful - a necessary condition - in the efficient operation of local authority departments and sports centres, the propensity towards acclaiming 'management' as the central element has limitations. Firstly, it has given precedence to the provider or supplier of recreational opportunity rather than the potential user and the real needs of members of the community. The professional local authority sports and recreation manager starts from the position of having to

sell the wares of sport to a neighbourhood. This was particularly the case in the mid 1970s when the application of management to recreation was based on the principles and much of the practice of industrial production management. The language adopted drew on terms such as 'throughput', 'optimum use', 'man management', 'marketing' and 'work scheduling' (52). Such an approach conveyed manipulative and sexist overtones of the professional-client relationship. Community members appear to have been conceived as passive consumers, with recreation being offered in ways which limited freedoms and reduced the control of individuals over their lives. The Yates Committee Interim Report (1978) stated that Centre Managers saw their main tasks as office administration, public relations and marketing, programming of events in the centre and staffing matters. Other tasks included negotiations, day to day finance, committee work, activities and technical matters. Over twenty different skills and attributes were identified, the most important of which was 'man management' followed by organising ability, public relations, enthusiasm and administrative ability (53). The focus here was on the internal operations of recreation institutions rather than community needs, on professional expertise rather than the involvement of users in decisions in the recreation experience, and implicitly of maintaining the status quo - albeit more efficiently - rather than giving priority to change in the balance of power in society. It was not that the political processes were ignored in the development of recreation management. Indeed, as more than one West Midlands Chief Officer indicated, recreation officers need to be political animals, but this was usually conceived in strategic management terms as

getting on with people, using people and situations for the benefit of your service ... to be friendly, but not too friendly or identify with any one group (political party) or person (54).

The divisions between political parties were also seen to be not very great with regard to recreation provision and management. It was stated by one recreation officer that:

Labour and Tory policies sometimes vary
(i.e. in dogma Tories emphasise rate
cutting and Labour more services,
though here with caution) but in
practice they often come to the same
solution and policies after being in
office for a period - i.e rational
planning (55).

In this way the political process was reduced to the provider's or manager's definition of reality.

Secondly, although in the later 1970s and 1980s management approaches became more people oriented, at least in national policy statements, the professional and bureaucratic framework of local authority structures acted as a restriction to a genuine passage of power to the people, even where there was a political will to bring this about. In cases where it was patently not the real concern to alter the balance of power, the 'people approach' has also been exploited as an ideological strategy for a centrally directed populism. By the early 1980s it was recognised by the leaders of the recreation management body that its earlier concerns with plant, then plans and programmes should be replaced by a people oriented approach. Torkildsen (1983) argued that local authorities had in the past concentrated too much on facilities and not enough on services and opportunities, and that if local authorities were to serve all sections of the community, including those who were disadvantaged, then supplying facilities alone was not enough (56). The Yates Committee Report on Recreation Management Training (1984) took a similar line but pointed out that recreation management for the present and future was not the management of people but for people,

in which individuals should be allowed to describe and express their own leisure needs and interests in a multitude of ways (57). But in practice this change in the rationale of recreation management could not be said to have filtered through in any uniform or significant way to the realities of local authorities and communities. Of the seven West Midlands Metropolitan Boroughs examined by the author it was evident that there had been a shift in direction from 1978-84 in three of the boroughs - Birmingham, Dudley and Wolverhampton where there was a stated policy concern (particularly in Birmingham) towards working for decentralisation of powers in relation to central government and a people oriented approach in the management of sport and recreation (58). It is apparent from documentary and interview sources that political shifts occurred between 1982 and 1984 in these authorities linked largely to the return to power of Labour councils which were manifested in policies for recreation. In Birmingham the post-May 1984 Labour policy in Leisure Services was about, 'power to the people', and providing a service based on a 'bottom up' approach rather than land-use strategy. In Dudley there was an explicit concern in 1984 to move from a rate-cutting policy favoured by the outgoing Conservatives towards a community orientation and the involvement of participants in decisions relating to the provision of recreation facilities. And in Wolverhampton there was a formally stated policy of giving priority in recreation provision to local residents and the unemployed. However, Labour-controlled authorities like Coventry and Sandwell displayed a more social-democratic and moderate stance. The concern of Coventry in recreation appeared to be more about corporate rationalisation and efficiency than a socially conscious thrust, whilst in Sandwell discrete lobbying of Conservative Government ministers was the stated strategy and the Council's recreation policy was one of equal opportunities rather than positive discrimination. A third category was discerned in Walsall and Solihull - the

former traditionally Labour but Conservative-led in 1984, and the latter traditionally Conservative. In both authorities the philosophies towards recreation management seemed to be more in tune with the land-based national policies of the 1960s or earlier. In Walsall the recreation department's concerns appeared to be more about allotments, cemeteries and horticulture than assessing community needs, and in Solihull the dominant view of the Council appeared to be that if people wanted to play sport they should be prepared to pay for it. Birmingham Council seemed to have broken through the red-tape of local authority management structures more than most, but even here there were conflicts between departments and differences between the local authority Recreation and Community Department and the local sports council. Furthermore, its social and community thrust can be questioned on the grounds of being more about a management concern to ameliorate social problems through leisure provision than providing real gains for the unemployed, ethnic minorities or women.

The 'people philosophy' was not in any case exclusively about a socialist notion of empowering people. Indeed, it has been increasingly appropriated by the new Right in the 1980s as a strategy for coping with the problem of inner cities. This was particularly evident in Lord Young's announcement in 1986 as Secretary of State for Employment of a new inner-city initiative for bringing together the efforts of the local community, local government, the private sector and central governments under the banner of a 'people philosophy' (59). The theme here was of 'self-help' and 'enterprise'. Lord Young's interpretation and advocacy of a people philosophy was framed within a commitment to encouraging a 'sense of market opportunity', of changing attitudes of people to accept personal responsibility but within an increasingly privatised setting. In this political and ideological climate an emphasis on management did not disappear, but shifted its style and focus to

the management of detached work with young people - a form of 'rational recreation' championed by the national and regional offices of the Sports Council (60). However, even with this more face-to-face management between provider and public, the structures of local authorities often worked against the effective involvement of the young in sport. In Wolverhampton, for instance, it was revealed that under 10% of the 16-25 age group were involved in organised youth activities, and despite the stated intentions by the local authority about meeting the needs of people, it appeared that policy at the local sports council level was passed down from the local authority officers without due consultation with local sports representatives (61).

Thirdly, it has also been shown - though in the Greater London Council of the 1980s more than in Birmingham - that management in sport and recreation can extend power to community groups providing it is appropriately politically directed. But this has to follow an ideological shift like that of the G.L.C. from 1980-86 which drew on new themes such as the stress on ethnic minority communities, the ideas as well as the political practice of the women's movement, and the changing approach to socialist organisation involving increased controls by the workforce (62). This political focus of the Left indeed established the management objectives for sport and recreation as well as other areas. However, even with the forcefulness of the G.L.C.'s radical thrust, the power of conservative opposition and the bureaucracy and professionalism of career generalist administrators provided intense resistance and struggle. The bureaucratic strength had been reinforced by the corporate management reforms of the 1960s and 1970s even though not uniformly internalised by all local authorities.

Joint Provision/Dual Use, Education and Recreation: Sharing or Incorporation?

The concepts of joint provision and dual use of recreation facilities

though not essentially new notions represented a new conjuncture in the late 1960s in the context of corporate planning and management, and underwent a further reconstruction as the political-ideological climate shifted under the influence of the new right in the 1980s. The traditional pattern of wider community use of facilities owned or provided for specific purposes of industry or education was based on the principle of individual initiative usually of a liberal-humanistic nature. For instance, in the 1920s, at a time of industrial unrest, Seebohm Rowntree advocated on community welfare grounds the co-operation of large employers with the local effort to provide playing fields for the general public (63). In the 1930s Henry Morris, as Chief Education Officer of Cambridgeshire developed 'village colleges' combining school, adult education and social facilities as social and moral centres of the community (64). But joint provision/dual use in the 1960s was contained in the combination of three corporatist elements. These comprised the involvement of government agencies, the raising of capital sources outside of the education sector to supplement educational finance, and the emphasis on community management structures. The interest of government departments and agencies in getting local authorities to combine and promote the shared use of resources continued during the 1970s and 1980s within a revisionist ideological thrust advanced both by Labour and Conservative administrations. Joint provision and dual-use was significant in technical and financial terms as a means of increasing provision of recreational facilities activities. But it was also significant in political and ideological ways for it served to legitimise the corporate movement and consensus politics of the 1960s and 1970s, and then, in the 1980s it was reinterpreted within the parameters of the market principles of the radical Right. In addition, at the level of the organisation and practice of sport, joint provision and dual use was the site for the expression of divergent ideologies which polarised around the political interplay between 'education' and 'recreation' interests.

Indeed, joint provision and dual use in the 1960s and 1970s stood for and upheld the prevailing corporate principles of central control, co-ordination and more effective management within local settings. However, although defined as a means of extending recreational opportunities it fell short of meeting the recreational needs of the working class, ethnic minorities or women. Resources were to be more efficiently tapped, but there was no concern about whether the resources should be redistributed to disadvantaged and working class groups - at least in ways which brought about a shift in control. The impetus was economic, social and organisational. It was seen by government agencies and local authorities to be commonsense to look for financially viable ways of increasing provision of facilities, and this was also regarded as a way of meeting the needs of members of the community - though somewhat vaguely in a top-down social-democratic political and ideological framework. The central direction is very apparent in the regularity and consistency of government and central agency decrees on the matter. A number of circulars, reports and papers have been issued, the constant theme of which has been the better use of scarce resources. The D.E.S. and H. and L.G. joint circular 11/64 'Provision of Facilities for Sport' drew attention to the possibilities of obtaining better value for money by combining educational sports facilities for use by both pupils and the general public (65). The Ministry of Housing and Local Government Circular 31/66 - Public Expenditure: Miscellaneous Schemes, underlined that savings could be achieved by joint provision advocating consultation with the new Regional Sports Councils on new projects. A D.E.S. circular 2/70 entitled, 'The Chance to Share', gave further impetus to the development of joint schemes (66). The concept was also encouraged in the House of Lords Report, Sport and Leisure, (1973) (67), the White Paper, Sport and Recreation 1975 (68) and in a joint report of Local Authority Associations, 'Towards a Wider

Use' (1976) (69). The Sports Council and C.C.P.R. have stressed its importance in a range of documents and reports from 1968 (70). All the Ministers for Sport since 1965 - both Labour and Conservative - have endorsed the need for authorities to give it priority in the design of the new schools (71).

The economic arguments for joint provision and dual use were prominently and repeatedly made during the social democratic political consensus but changing economic climate of the 1960s and 1970s, with pressure being exerted from the centre on education authorities, business firms and the armed forces to make their facilities available for use by other members of the community. Denis Howell as parliamentary-Under-Secretary of State at the Department of Education and Science in 1968, in the context of Labour's emphasis on planning and investment in local authorities, argued that the rewards for implementing joint schemes were very great in terms of more intensive use, better facilities for all users and value for money (72). In 1975, in the changed circumstances of the Labour Government's announcement of reductions in public expenditure, this position was reinforced through the Department of the Environment's White paper on Sport and Recreation, in which local authorities and the Sports Council were urged to give priority to projects which provided scope for wider use within the community (73). At this stage the economic advantages to be gained were more explicitly linked to the social benefits that Government sought to achieve. Local authorities were seen by Government to be the main providers of new sports facilities, but in a climate of financial cut-backs and urban blight dual-use of recreation schemes became significant in the context of helping to alleviate the stresses of young people in the big cities.

The social costs and benefits of joint and direct sports provision were

explored in greater detail in the study by Coopers and Lybrand Associates Ltd commissioned by the Sports Council in 1979 (74). The reason for the study given by the Sports Council was that despite a decade and a half of Ministerial exhortation and circulars and the Sports Council's own promotion of the concept of joint provision of sports facilities, a substantial minority of authorities had either not implemented any policy or showed only minimal acceptance of it. However, it is relevant to note that Coopers and Lybrand not only presented ideas for the benefits of sports provision in the 1980s in 'rational recreation' terms focusing on improvement of the defects of working-class youth in almost identical language to that used by central authorities in the context of recession and unemployment in the 1930s, but that their findings were generally welcomed by the Sports Council. Indeed, not only is this study an illustration of the shift in the corporate movement in which government agencies relied more on business management consultants, but it conceives of costs and benefits in terms of their function for the dominant political order. The significance of community use of school, industry or armed services resources in the cost-benefit analysis approach was to set an economic value on sports centres in relation to their purpose of 'helping youngsters to retain their pride in personal achievement, self-respect and enjoyment through a recession' (75). In this regard intensification of facility use and the resulting increase in participation by members of the community for whom they were not initially provided needs to be located within the wider ideological and political purpose of legitimization of a market oriented Conservative Government.

The social purpose of joint provision/dual use has also been projected forward into the 1990s and beyond in an attempt to reinforce ideas of community integration in the 1980s. Writing in 1986 on 'Future Trends in Recreation and Leisure', James Munn, Director of Recreation and Community for

the City of Birmingham, epitomised the professional management approach which tends to assume a social integration objective within the prevailing political system (76). He indicated that no public sector issue had received such exposure as joint provision and dual use, or what he described as 'integrated community development', but that the absence of inter-agency management policy had led to failure of the public sector to build a national strategy concerned with better use of education and recreation resources. His solution was based on a decentralised management and political structure - such as that claimed for Birmingham - for the purpose of developing a fully comprehensive community education and recreation programme which he held to be an important initiative to meet the needs of a post-industrial society. However, despite the apparent socially conscious approach, this position seems to contain values which uphold the existing class-based society. He stated:

The fabric of society is the point at issue ... in resource management terms we have been muddling through ... Unless we can grasp the nettle we will find ourselves part of a divided society. The future role of the senior local authority corporate managers must be about the successful development of the post-industrial village, urban and rural, within which people will be able to generate socially useful roles and relationships, while meeting their personal leisure needs within a comprehensive community-orientated approach; one involving central government, local authority and voluntary agencies. If we fail, violence will certainly become the tool for social change. The issue is not about which department delivers the service, it is about partnership for people (77).

Munn's views as an influential West Midlands local authority practitioner are significant because they indicate how an apparent commitment to a socialist programme contains contradictory elements. They are also important to consider as an illustration of how a liberal-humanist project can be appropriated and championed by market-led conservative politicians. Munn's

analysis is skewed because it starts from the position of management, separates leisure from social and economic structures, and conceives of post-industrialism - and leisure as an essential dimension of it - as an ideal and inevitable state. The management stance taken appears intrinsically to be defending the fabric of the prevailing capitalist society, and conveys a Fabian-like paternalist form of socialism in which leisure is promoted to ameliorate social problems. Divisions in society and forms of violence seem to be identified as a symptom of inadequate organisation and provision rather than of expressions of inequalities rooted in the structures of social class. Although he alludes to the importance of decentralisation of political structures, the ideal perception of community recreation he transmits is one which is framed by practical considerations of maintaining order, of co-ordination of effort by providers, and of providing leisure choice for consumers. There is no indication of a search for understanding of the meaning and significance of life for communities, which would require a cultural analysis rather than a management perspective. It is to be expected, perhaps, that a practitioner whose career has been guided by organisational considerations would be unlikely to view notions of shared provision and use of facilities in other than a management perspective. However, because public statements by senior officers like Munn can take on a political and ideological significance when supported by Government ministers, government agencies like the Sports Council and local authority members - as indeed they have been - then the hidden messages and their implications need to be critically examined (78). This becomes more necessary when ideas like the social significance of leisure and the creation of a post-industrial society are introduced without a clear appreciation of the deeper meaning that is implied.

Munn's argument, grounded in post-industrial society theories, is that

working hours will decline within a high technology and communications-based society, and that in the next century community education and community development will become the leading service industries, and employ a large percentage of the working population. In this context it is held that people would need to not simply use organised leisure and recreation resources, but learn how to use their leisure in 'satisfying and creative ways'. The limitation of the post-industrial analysis in general, and Munn's version of it in particular, is that it mistakes changes of form for changes in the essence of capitalist society. It does not follow that because of changes of technology and communications that existing patterns of social organisation will also be changed. As Clarke and Critcher argue:

The economic logic of profitability and the private ownership of capital are unchanged by the growth of the service sector ... The concentrations of power and interest which control the direction of change survive to tell us that their way is the natural, inevitable and only path to follow (79).

Traditional approaches to the concentration of power and interest are contained in the corporate management perspective itself and the particular focus on joint-planning and dual-provision as a community development, which is driven from above either in a paternalistic liberal and social democratic form, or in the neo-liberal and radical Right appropriation of urban renewal through market values. Although Munn's approach under a Labour-led Council and Recreation Committee may be to conceptualise joint planning/dual use as being about 'giving people a stake in the development of their environment' and a 'village community concept in the urban sector' (80), power seems to be maintained by the local authority and its pre-occupation with community development from the centre.

The West Midlands Regional Sports Council also focused on the policy of 'joint provision and joint use' as a key issue in their Regional Recreational Strategy for the 1980s, addressing the question of why the policy had been only partially implemented (81). They indicated that their Council had produced two reports on the subject and that much of the Sports Council grant aid for new schemes in the region went to joint provision schemes. However, the report failed to provide an answer beyond identifying the need for the Council to monitor the policy and ways of encouraging the practice, while being realistic about the difficulties. More information and assessment was sought as a means of giving the benefit of others' experience to those contemplating new schemes. In common with the plethora of policy statements on joint provision and use the emphasis has been on managerial solutions with little account taken of the dynamics of control, of the wider structural factors such as the influence of media and commerce on the values and attitudes adopted by clients, or of the underlying ideological meaning of the vested interests.

It is the traditional dichotomy between 'education' and 'recreation' in the organisation of physical education and sport that has been the focus for conflicts of interest surrounding the policy of joint provision and use. At face value it would appear that the nature of their differences merely relates to the developing area of recreation attempting to gain greater control of resources traditionally held by education under its mandatory provision authorised in the 1944 Education Act, which required adequate physical education facilities for schools (82). However, for a fuller understanding it is important to consider the ideological significance and political purposes behind the education and recreation disputes over provision and use of facilities. For instance, it seems necessary to assess whether the value positions

of the two sectors were essentially different and to identify those interests which 'education' wished to preserve beyond maintaining dominant use for young people of school age, from those which 'recreation' wished to gain beyond the use of education facilities. It is also significant to pursue the question of why co-ordination between education and recreation has been so ineffective given the importance to the state of maximising opportunities for legitimising its political hegemony. Is it simply a case of inadequate organisation in management terms, or is the political strategy either not fully developed or meeting resistance at local level?

It is apparent that from the mid-1960s to the late 1970s a shift in emphasis occurred from 'sport in education' to 'sport in recreation'. As indicated in previous chapters, during this period the importance of recreation was increasingly recognised by institutions of government in the context of social concerns about the use of leisure time, and of economic prospects with the expansion of the leisure industry. At the same time, assumptions underlying the liberal ideology of education and its expansion in the 1960s, of the importance of schooling in achieving economic growth through technological development and of overcoming social inequalities, came under attack from central government, business interests and a more critical academic perspective (83). Whilst the scope for utilising recreation to legitimise the capitalist system and to maintain the existing social relations became more evident through a liberal-humanist concern to redress inequalities of provision for mass sport, and a business interest in extending sport as entertainment largely through the media, the confidence in the educational system to consolidate economic and social advance was being eroded both by employers and professionals in education (84). Liberal humanism as

an ideological force in recreation has rested on the role it has performed as the activity dimension of attempts to construct a participating leisure society. This is expressed by Clarke and Critcher (85) as a 'struggle to control the uses of free time' as much as an identification with 'freedom, choice and satisfied needs'. A key feature of this strategy has been the instrumental use of sport in and for the community on a class basis. As a movement of middle class provision for the masses, the 'rational recreation' of the Victorian era, and the 'recreative training' of the 1930s were antecedents of the 'Sport for All' campaign of the 1970s. In relation to joint provision and use of facilities this instrumentalism is also evident in the focus on community development and integration. Munn (1974) claimed that an integrated community approach to recreation provision played a significant part in individual and social development. The absence of vandalism in school-based community recreation was said by Munn to have been due to 'sound management' and to a great extent to the 'integration of youth and adults and the sense of belonging associated with community development' (86). This liberal-humanist theme - which showed a concern with social conditions but failed to locate the source of inequalities in the social structure - resonated with the social-democratic statist approach of a Labour Government in the mid 1970s, and was also taken up by the Conservative Minister for Sport, Neil Macfarlane, in the early 1980s under a market-oriented Thatcher administration. Indeed, Macfarlane applauded the views and approach of Munn in developing, co-ordinating and marketing adult education, youth and community recreation services in Labour-led Birmingham from 1982, and took some credit for his appointment there (87). Although the party political differences of a Conservative minister and Labour local authority were apparent, the effectiveness of sport and recreation in harmonising community problems appeared to be the paramount concern and common interest. The social value of sporting activities for Macfarlane was contained in their scope as a

palliative for 'unemployed youth or in combating crime', and this differed very little from the language of the earlier White Paper, 'Sport and Recreation' (1975) issued by a Labour Government (88).

Whilst the political thrust was essentially different - the maintenance of social democracy in the mid-1970s and the promotion of an authoritarian populism in the 1980s, the focus of community integration remained the same. In this respect liberal-humanism which has been a key ideological basis of education policies has also featured strongly in recreation policies. Indeed, it has informed a recreation practice which attacked education administration on the basis that its structures and its practices were impeding the scope for community welfare. The offensive by recreation interests on education were levelled through parliament as well as sport and recreation agencies. The written evidence to the House of Lords Report on Sport and Leisure (1973), drew attention to the need to introduce new legislative powers to give scope for the recreation sector to control more tightly the allocation of resources (89). Referring specifically to the 1944 Education Act, the report uses the evidence of Denis Molyneux to argue that a weakness of the Act is that it allows wide interpretation by individual education authorities with regard to recreation provision. The House of Lords Report also held that the education field cannot be relied upon to take a lead within public investment. Indeed, the then Chief Education Officer for Derbyshire, Sir Jack Longland, is quoted as saying that,

education authorities are not the
right sort of practising missionaries
in spreading public provision of
sport and recreation (90).

In recommending that a statutory duty be placed on local authorities to provide for recreation it was envisaged that recreation and education would be drawn together in the same hands with one Council being responsible through different Committees for

the two services (91), (though this would not be the case where County Councils controlled education). The relationship sought was one of co-operative planning, but clearly the objective was to put pressure on the education authority into altering the practice of 'the recreational planners having to fit everything into the education machine'. Indeed one of the major responsibilities the House of Lords Committee advocated for the new local authority departments of recreation which it brought into being was the promotion of 'dual provision' (92). At the management level it is evident that there was a strong preference by the Cobham Committee for Recreation Departments over Education in manning operations, and in developing new leadership with management training and skills. The Report recommended that L.E.A.s give serious consideration to the possibilities of having their school playing fields and other sports facilities run by the Recreation Departments (93). Cobham argued that the change would provide the education service with professional management along with the other benefits of promoting the maximum community use of facilities at times when the school did not want them, of helping meet the needs of school leavers who shy away from 'school' facilities, and of introducing a caretaking force which was more closely related to the facility than to one section of users, i.e. school pupils. The White Paper on Sport and Recreation (1975) also argued that in the interests of the whole community it was wrong in principle if good and expensive facilities were underused and indicated that the main responsibility lay with education authorities (94). The Sports Council made frequent and persistent attempts to influence education authorities. This included publicity for schemes whereby with additional relatively small investment to that from education, modest sports centres could be built on school sites, thus hoping to attract Chief Education Officers to the benefits of gaining 'improved facilities for school use as well as

serving the needs of community'. This was reinforced by the offer of grant-aid to selected education authorities like Walsall (95). In addition, the C.C.P.R. called for the greater use by the public of facilities such as school swimming pools which it held were much under used (96).

However, the underlying significance of these reports and statements is contained in the wider political purposes indicated in the body of the texts. This includes a focus on 'providing for the well being of the community,' 'treating recreation as a social service' and emphasising that the problem of too little investment in facilities was 'beyond the reach of private enterprise and voluntary effort' (Cobham Committee, 1973). A political thrust is also revealed by the declaration that the Government had decided it would be right that the highest priority for grant aid should be accorded to 'suitable recreation projects in inner urban areas where living conditions were particularly poor by national standards and pressure on social services was severe'. (White Paper on Sport and Recreation 1975). It is shown too in Sports Council discussion on the subject of waging a campaign to persuade education and other owners to open up their facilities, where reference is made to concerns about the 'gap' in provision for the school leaver mentioned in the Wolfenden Report of 1960 as still being evident, 'and with it the high cost of vandalism' (97). The message was that joint provision and use needed to be fostered for social and political aims. As Hargreaves (1985) argued, the legitimacy of the political regime until the late 1970s rested to a significant extent on fostering equality of opportunity, achieving a degree of cultural democratisation, and creating a sense of community through welfare programming (98). The case for joint provision/use and the attack on education needs to be interpreted

within this wider project through its instrumental role of serving as an antidote to a variety of social problems - alienation, loneliness, juvenile crime, vandalism and hooliganism.

The counter arguments have been as forcibly made, particularly by the Society of Education Officers (Midland Region) questioning the special concentration on the education sector in the development of joint-use of facilities. The S.E.O. argued for the protection of facilities from unsuitable use and abuse, and that reciprocal arrangements for education use of recreation facilities needed to be more fairly considered. It also pointed out the refusal of many leisure authorities to participate in joint schemes (99). The S.E.O. further resisted the lobby in favour of transferring responsibility for education-based recreation facilities to Recreation Departments, asserting that the education interest in recreation does exist and that it is legitimately an extension of the education service in some authorities. Indeed, it argued that there is a distinction between the objectives of education and recreation in the promotion and development of recreation opportunities, and that education tries to ensure that there are possibilities for the progressive development of the individual. This was contrasted with the 'pay and play' policies and a commercial approach to the organisation of sports centres run by recreation managers where education and quality of life values seemed to be ignored (100). In defending its position the entrenched but threatened education sector was thus arguing for a liberal progressive ideological position against what it identified as the commercialism of mainstream sport and recreation. This polarisation may not be applicable in all instances. As indicated earlier in this section, the recreation movement promoted by Government and agencies like the Sports Council and C.C.P.R. contained a liberal-humanist dimension. Nevertheless, it

was also the case that sport and recreation became increasingly influenced by commercial considerations during the 1970s. However, by the late 1970s a number of education authorities had either simply ignored, resisted, or embraced dual provision use in their own terms. In the West Midlands region at this time separate provision for education (schools) and recreation (adult and community) was largely the pattern, and where joint schemes were adopted the interests of education were actually made more secure in the two notable instances, of the Metropolitan Boroughs of Walsall and Wolverhampton. The Walsall programme of community provision which dates from 1971 was concentrated in the Education Department. Here a number of designated community schools were established (by 1980 there were four secondary and two primary schools) which received funding from the Sports Council and local authority as well as D.E.S. for the provision of additional facilities. Although there were variations in the nature of this provision - some were purpose built new community schools, others converted - the key organisational principle was the dominance of the Headteacher in the management structure. Consequently, although casual and club use was fostered in addition to school activities the philosophy of these centres started from an education rather than recreation base. The headteachers and community directors favoured the close association with the school rather than a separate recreation management type system (101). Wolverhampton also maintained a strong education influence in the development of additional recreation provision for schools through the appointment of the Physical Education Organiser to a position of having joint responsibility for recreation and education. The organiser had a desk in the Planning Department and an office in the Education Department, and although dual use of facilities became the main policy for vision of all recreation sports halls sited in school buildings it appeared that these developments

were controlled by education and physical education interests through the Deputy Chief Education Officer, the Physical Education and Recreation Organiser and the appointment of four school Heads of Physical Education as Physical Recreation Development Officers (102).

In summary, it has been argued that joint provision and dual use of recreational facilities has served to legitimise the political hegemony of social democracy as an adjunct to corporate planning and management in the 1960s and 1970s, but it has also been incorporated into the changing dominant order of an entrepreneurial, market and privatised politics. However, it is apparent that at the local level, policies of provision and use are worked through in a complex and varied fashion. Authorities which seem to hold socialist principles may, in practice, take a more liberal-humanist stance, which can be incorporated into the radical Right programme for community cohesion in inner cities. In addition, some local education authorities may appear to have embraced dual use but in terms where they have gained additional resources and maintained control of community recreation provision in their districts. Assessment of the political and ideological interplay between recreation and education interests indicates that in addition to the economic arguments for sharing of resources, sport and recreation bodies, from the Department of the Environment to the Sports Council, have presented their case in liberal-humanist terms of community integration. At the same time education authorities increasingly under attack from within and from outside have maintained a distance on the ideological basis of individual development rather than commercially oriented management, and on the practical grounds of incapacity of some schools for community use. However, although the Department of Education and Science seems not to have co-operated with the Department of the Environment, reinforcing the divisions

between education and recreation at the local level (103), the intensification of direct intervention of the state from the mid-1980s with a more forceful political and ideological strategy of competitive market values may bring education and recreation together. In the debate about school sport in the 1980s, in which the Central Council of Physical Recreation led an attack on the DES and Physical Education bodies for neglecting to maintain the standard and involvement of pupils in competitive activities, both the Conservative and Labour Party opposition confirmed their support for competition in school sport. And under the pressure of a Government review of the place of sport in the school curriculum the Physical Education Association of Great Britain issued a statement which indicated that the school system and community system should be combined to provide opportunities for novices and experts (104). Nevertheless, the way in which this is interpreted and developed in particular local education authorities is likely to reflect political and ideological positions as well as opportunistic practices. Whilst the I.L.E.A. Working Party on 'Physical Education and Sport in Schools' chaired by Peter McIntosh recommended in 1988 that the authority should actively encourage competitive school sport and physical education, the debate was widened to make a case for the expansion of the general physical education programme for casual as well as committed performers. The Government's proposed allocation of 5 per cent of curriculum time for fourth and fifth year pupils in the proposed new national curriculum was described as 'totally inadequate'. Furthermore, the report also reflected the deep anger and resentment among ethnic minority groups especially Afro-Caribbeans, who it was stated

feel that their children are being channelled into sport away from academic pursuits, and that sport is being used as an instrument of social control (105).

Central and Local Relations: Free Market Conservatism and Municipal Socialism

It has been argued that the pattern of provision for sport and recreation at the local level is the outcome of a complex relationship between the ideological and political intervention of governments and national agencies, and the way this is interpreted and either internalised, resisted or transformed in regional and local institutions and settings. As already demonstrated, the corporate planning and management approach of Labour and Conservative governments in the 1960s and 1970s emphasised co-ordination and national, regional and local co-operation in the interests of economic and social stability. Indeed, between the mid-1960s and mid-1970s the overall political dialectic was based on government by involvement, persuasion and co-operation as well as firm management. The establishment of leisure and recreation departments in local government reflected and reinforced this consensus in which public services were treated as part of the 'social wage' - 'a consequence of and reward for better industrial productivity and order' (106). An examination of the concepts of dual provision and use of sport and recreation facilities focused on this period of social democratic consensus in seeking to understand the ideological and political significance they held when first introduced. It was also necessary to recognise how policies had been shaped and transformed as the social democratic mode came under the stress of economic crisis, middle class reaction over national decline, and a change in government policy on the management of the economy. However, further analysis of the post-1979 period and of the changing balance between

central and local powers is important for a fuller understanding both of the underlying political and ideological influences and the functioning and symbolic meaning of sport.

A clear break and dislocation in this social democratic consensus approach occurred in 1979 with the electoral victory of a Conservative Government under Mrs. Thatcher. The rhetoric of intention to roll back the powers of the state had a popular appeal which Thatcherism exploited, but in reality even greater controls were exerted in an effort not only to make capitalism more efficient in general economic terms, but through ideological and political intervention to shift the balance of power to the Right and to make this appear as a natural and popular need. As Stuart Hall points out,

Thatcherism has been remarkably successful at moving the counters around so as to forge a connection between the popular aspiration for greater freedom from constraining powers and the market definition of freedom. It has created a chain of equivalences between the reaction against state bureaucracy, so deeply inscribed in the Fabian version of social democracy, and the quite different passion for self-sufficiency, self-help and rampant individualism (107).

However, this process was not a single-handed achievement of the Prime Minister; but rather a combined effort of the Thatcher Government's Ministers and selected individuals operating state agencies across a range of interests.

In the central/local state relations of sport and recreation significant figures in this exercise were Michael Heseltine, M.P., when Secretary of State for the Department of the Environment, Ian McCallum, Chairman of the Association of District Council and Vice Chairman of the Sports Council, Hector Munro, M.P., Minister for

Sport 1979-1982, and Neil Macfarlane, Minister for Sport 1982-1985.

Heseltine set the scene in his address to local authority council representatives at Scarborough 20th September 1979 stating,

The objective of my inner city policy is for local government to bring about in the depressed areas the conditions which will encourage the private sector to come in, and to come in on a large scale ... (108).

At the same time, McCallum, as a local authority spokesman, talked about legislation to provide local authorities with greater direction to decide for themselves levels of provision, but also reminded delegates of the need for discipline in resisting excessive pay demands (109). He exhorted authorities to look for ways of encouraging business and industry to their towns and villages. He felt that some structure plans were too restrictive and, indeed, questioned whether structure plans were needed at all. He asserted that local authorities should be given more freedom to act locally and that there should be less control from the centre, yet he also held that it was in the national interest that there should be effective controls on the total of local government spending. Both men were part of the radical Right crusade and although representing national and local government respectively were in tune in their overall Conservative philosophy. McCallum, a government appointee as Vice-Chairman of the Sports Council was also in a position to exert an influence in the policies of the administration of Sport at the highest level.

Hector Munro, then Neil MacFarlane, related the broad Conservative Thatcherist approach directly to sport. In addition to appointing McCallum to the Sports Council (11th June 1980), Munro presided over the relaxation of central government controls over public paths and rights of way, but placed pressure on local

authorities to withdraw support for the 1980 Olympic Games (110). His message to sport was that future policies should look for every opportunity to involve the private sector (111). Macfarlane expressed concern about the limited spending on grass roots sport, but in terms of urging the Sports Council to build sports facilities and work alongside local authorities to reduce the tensions and problems in the cities and towns (112). So whilst talking about freedom they were actually embarking on policies to impose greater constraints and use sport to depoliticise and displace social problems.

The Secretary of State for the Environment stated in Parliament on 27th June 1979 that the Government was considering punitive measures to be taken against local authorities which contrary to government policy, tried to get out of difficult situations by putting up their rates. As Gordon Oakes, Labour M.P. commented,

It was a serious matter when the relationship had so broken down that central government talked about some sort of local government co-ercion bill to deal with local authorities who, knowing their own requirements and spending needs where to be prevented by legislation from carrying out their duties to their electorate as M.P.s were entitled to carry out their duties in Parliament to their constituents (113).

This hounding of socially-conscious but high-spending local authorities was pursued during the life time of the 1979-1983 Government and the post-1983 Government - and with particular zeal in respect of the Metropolitan Counties who were abolished in 1985. The Department of Environment also commissioned the firm Coopers and

Lybrand to survey and report on the possibilities of local authorities hiving off a variety of services to the private sector, with some implications for leisure and recreation (114).

However, one of the advantages for local authorities in terms of freedom from Government controls is that recreation receives permissive rather than statutory powers. Although this might also have limitations there is, in theory and practice, more room for manoeuvre for chief officers and members of local councils (115). This can work to the advantage or disadvantage of sport and recreation. Free from statutory obligations an authority can provide what it considers necessary for its citizens; equally, it can neglect to provide what might be regarded by agencies like the Sports Council or National Playing Fields Association as essential services.

For instance, the Chief Executive of Thanet had, by 1983, implemented a policy of selling off sports centres to other private agencies or sports clubs thus relieving the authority of the running costs (116). Furthermore by presenting this as the only alternative in the current economic climate he would appear to be acting out the Thatcher Government's ideological commitment towards naturalising privatisation. Ironically, however, the permissive powers of local authorities, even when conservative controlled, can work against privatisation, as in Waverley, Surrey where a senior officer stated, that the freedom of the Leisure Services Committee was jealously guarded by the Tory Councillors who back local authority support for recreational facilities on the basis of extending the quality of life (117). Clearly the heterogeneity of local authority Recreation Services throughout the country leads to a

variation in policy and practice in the interpretation of local powers in relation to central government guidelines or pressures which reflect ideological and political differences.

However, there are trends which stem from the ideological and political intervention of central government and which have led to a lessening of opportunities for local communities in sport and recreation. This concerns particularly the selling-off of recreational land by local authorities to property developers - in response to the economic constraints imposed by central government. The pressure points have been applied by two actions of legislation: Statutory Instrument 909 issued by the Department of Education and Science in 1981, which stipulated half a hectare of playing land for every 150 pupils with each field capable of sustaining seven hours of play per week (118); and the Land Act of 1981 (119), which required local authorities to identify unused or derelict lands and list them in a National Land Register. Together, these two requirements seemed to create a climate within a number of local authorities which encouraged the sale of any land that could be claimed to be under used, and although land in active recreational use was excluded, it appeared that this also has been listed for sale. As reported in the national press and confirmed by contact with officials (120), the Central Council of Physical Recreation, having recognised the threat, was to the fore in the campaign to draw public attention to the matter. It was estimated that of the 100,000 acres of amenity grasslands recorded in a 1977 survey, one third were threatened by the provision of Statutory Instrument 909. The C.C.P.R. conducted a national survey in May 1982 and found 2370 acres of recreational land registered as surplus. By January of 1983, 1,277 acres had been added to the list.

Although no central body of statistics exists which accurately reveals the reduction in recreational land an important source for the West Midlands is the Birmingham and District Football Association which has documented the loss of over 70 private football pitches since 1945 (121). The West Midlands was particularly hard hit, at a time of high unemployment, where it was assessed (1982) that, 'during the past decade at least 100 acres of sports grounds have been lost' (122).

The C.C.P.R. deplored a perceived growing tendency for local authorities to trade off fields against community sports centres, but argued that, 'swapping cricketers and footballers for badminton and squash is no gain at all' (123). A further irony of this issue was the position of the Minister for Sport, Neil Mcfarlane, and the Sports Council. Mcfarlane was apparently responsible for the publication of Statutory Instrument 909 when at the Department of Education, and as a reaction to the C.C.P.R. criticism he asked the Sports Council to conduct its own survey (124). The results appeared to contradict the C.C.P.R. findings *when it reported that there was a* small net gain in playing areas. In reply, the C.C.P.R. maintained that their point was not that the land was already sold, but that it was on the Register and 'up for grabs'. However, within a short while the Sports Council appeared to join battle to save the growing number of playing fields threatened by development. This is another case however, where the relative independence of the Central Council of Physical Recreation from Central government compared to the Sports Council - who are much more closely involved with the Department of Environment and Minister for Sport - has enabled them to take a lead against state initiatives. Although reduced in size and status after 1972 with the transfer of its assets to the government-aided Sports Council, the C.C.P.R. actually took a political lead in the Thatcher

years, both in challenging the connections of the Sports Council with government and indeed the Government itself on the 1980 Olympic boycott, as well as raising public awareness on a number of issues. In addition to the attack on the DES over provision for competitive sport in schools, it set up the Howell Committee on 'Sponsorship' drawing attention to the loss of control by governing bodies to business agents, and expressed concern about the loss of sports facilities with the abolition of the Greater London Council, as well as acting as a pressure group on Government and local authorities on the matter of playing field losses (125).

The threat to playing fields did seem to be a real and growing one, with instances of well used space being taken from recreation service. Like the Midlands, the London region had a number of cases reported. The Sunday Times in September, 1983 revealed that, in the last year the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea placed its 39 acres of playing fields at Northolt (Middlesex) on the register, despite the fact that the site was used by up to 500 sportsmen each week. The Borough planned to sell the land for £5,400,000 for the building of 650 houses. In the London Borough of Haringey, the Council gave itself planning permission to build 24 houses on the Coldfall School playing fields - even though the Borough had well under half the minimum area recommended by the National Playing Fields Association (126).

Such developments were the result of central government pressures on local authorities in the first instance. Rate capping and financial restrictions forced local authorities to seek ways of making their assets work for them. In some cases, particularly where sport and recreation were not given high priority, or where, as in Thanet, it was considered to be more efficient management to hive off

sports facilities, then provision for the community in this area may be reduced. But a further and more ideological change is involved in that the movement towards privatisation is thereby aided and consolidated. As a Guardian reporter commented (9th August, 1983) on this topic, 'A programme of cashing in on publicly-owned assets fits neatly into the government's notion of an economic philosophy' (127). It is not that the resistance to this trend (by C.C.P.R. and latterly the Sports Council), is made from any ideological position, but rather that they are fighting for their professional interest - the retention of sports facilities per se. In this respect, the Tory Minister for Sport may have been playing a dual role - being seen to be upholding the mantle of sport, but at the same time pursuing broader party political objectives. In some areas and instances these may have conflicted. His reported comment in reply to the C.C.P.R., on the issue of the sale of recreational land is revealing. He stated that

... Any 'recreation' land on the (Land) register has therefore been identified by its owners as under used for its purpose ... The classification of particular sites is of course done locally; and if sports clubs etc. feel that any land has been wrongly defined, it is open to them to try and persuade the owners to put into fuller recreational use (128).

The statement is patently bland and lukewarm in supporting any kind of active campaign against local councils who were in effect giving practical expression to the radical Right philosophy of self help, and shifting the balance towards speculation and enterprise. Causes for sport appeared to be acceptable so long as they upheld the government's general policies, and in this respect McFarlane was taking a similarly political line to his predecessor Hector Munro, who campaigned so actively for a boycott of the 1980 Olympic Games.

However, the problem was a complex one for local authorities. As Ken Russell wrote in the Sunday Telegraph 7th November, 1982, about Coventry City Council's dilemma,

An estimated one quarter of all the privately-owned playing fields (270 acres) is in danger of disappearing unless the City Council acts. Coventry's major problem is finance. If the City Council declines planning permission for recreational areas to be re-zoned for other types of development, then the moral obligation to purchase is present (129).

To some extent the problem of the sale of recreational land was related to a shift in demand in recreational activities particularly in those provided by industrial sports clubs - away from team games requiring resources of grass pitches and towards indoor sports and entertainment. Nevertheless, as already indicated, land was being identified for sale where a clear demand was evident.

But, the real point is that the ideological thrust of the Conservative government of the 1980s has been towards exploiting market potential rather than social needs. On the one hand Coventry has been engaged in an Action Sport campaign which set out to engage young unemployed people in sporting activities and demonstrated a need for facilities; but on the other, recreational land was being threatened and commercially exploited. The power appears to rest not entirely with the local council in this situation, but local industry, and this underlines that local democracy has corporate forces to contend with where the local state is increasingly in contact with companies.

If the pursuit of the play of market forces has been the dominant principle of social organisation to have emerged in the 1980s, an alternative approach has also been demonstrated. As

already indicated the major force has been the Radical Right policies of the Thatcher administrations with their attempt to influence local policies. But at the same time there have been developments in Labour-controlled local authorities notably London, but also Sheffield and Birmingham to some extent.

As indicated earlier, the Greater London Council approach of the early 1980s in particular appeared to be quite innovative and different from traditional Left approaches, marking a break from the consensus of Labour social democratic policies and practices of the 1950s to 1970s. It represented a radical socialist movement across the totality of services. In sport, this was shown in the Report by the Director of Recreation and the Arts in October, 1983 in which the thrust of its policy objectives was shifted towards support for relatively deprived areas with limited facilities. It funded minority sports which had been traditionally under resourced, and gave priority to schemes seeking to expand facilities for use by women, ethnic minorities, the disabled, the unemployed and over 50s (130). Much of this was still evolving when threatened with abolition by the Conservative Government, which can be interpreted as a war on local democracy.

Despite the short life of the radical Left G.L.C., there are several aspects of its practices which can be highlighted to present a model of a particular kind of local state against which to contrast the more Labour socialist policies of most of the Metropolitan Boroughs in the West Midlands. The first notable point is that the policies which were being explored for sport involved a critical sociological analysis of a kind hitherto not made in post-war

Britain - as a combined theoretical and practical discourse within the local state. In this task, a conference held in December, 1983 examined the way cultural resources and practices were unequally produced, distributed and consumed in terms of class, race, sex and age, and set out a model of what was possible under a radical socialist programme (131). The focus on sport asserted that it was vital that local authorities made some resistance to the susceptibility of sport to financial dictates, consumer pressures, sexist ideologies and selective definitions which commercial organisations put on sport. Several possible areas of intervention for the Council were highlighted for further analysis, investigation and debate which included: a challenge to the selective representation of sport by the media, especially with regard to its predominant image of sport as requiring stereotyped male characteristics of competitiveness, strength, determination courage etc.; the countering of the selective nature of commercial sponsorship of sport by fostering sponsorship for local sports clubs and events, women's and ethnic minority sports, and by concentrating its own funding efforts on less privileged sports and people; the further study of the sports clothing and footwear industry to decide whether this might be an appropriate area of intervention for the Greater London Enterprise Board; and the opening up of professional sports clubs and private sports clubs.

It was acknowledged by the G.L.C. sports spokesperson that there has been a change of emphasis in the intervention of central and local government and the Sports Council in the 1980s - from centrally located large-scale to more local small scale facilities and in increasing awareness of the problems of women, ethnic minorities, the unemployed and disabled and elderly, but that the consequences of playing sport under a market economy had not been

fully grasped (132). This has already been revealed in the earlier analysis of the approaches towards marketing joint provision/shared use of facilities, and in the Sports Council's strategy outlined in 'Sport and the Community: the Next Ten years', which assumed commercial considerations - indeed it promoted the market potential of sport.

The positions outlined in the foregoing pages - of central government market policies under a Thatcher administration and Greater London Council policies of municipal socialism - indicate the different ends of the continuum of political stances and struggles which have emerged in Britain in the 1980s, and which have had a particular influence on sport and recreation. The transformation of values which equated freedom with the market and constraint with state bureaucracy was central to the anti-statist Thatcherist political project. But paradoxically, at the same time this has been progressively advanced through centralist policies which have penetrated into the area of sport both at its competitive and mass or community level. Indeed, the community focus and meaning of sport has been shaped by political forces since the 1960s but has gained increasing ideological significance as provision for sport and recreation has become an 'arm of government'.

Community and Order: the Shift to the Right

The connection between sport and the term 'community' has been repeatedly used by policy makers since the 1960s as a caption and theme for a range of issues and in different social and political contexts. The Wolfenden Committee Report (1960) was entitled 'Sport and the Community' and made its case on the basis of the general welfare of the community in relation to the prospect of considerably

increased leisure during the apparent period of affluence under a Conservative Government (133). The 'Sport for All' campaign initiated by the Council of Europe in 1966 was taken up in Britain and given a community provision flavour by the Sports Council in the early 1970s 'to arouse a new consciousness in government and local authorities of the value of sport for the community' (134) as a means of gaining increased facilities. The 'Football in the Community' scheme was introduced by the Labour Government through the Sports Council in 1978 to encourage Football League clubs to develop their facilities for 'community use' in socially deprived areas, and selected clubs were accordingly grant-aided to target on unemployed youth (135). The Sports Council's ten-year planning document 'Sport in the Community' (1982) was a strategy to set targets for participation in post-school and pre-retirement age-groups, and to identify the required financial resources in addition to emphasising the importance of skills in promotion and marketing (136). However, although the focus of the above reports and projects was guided by pressure from central government and its agencies the tendency to conceive and present community recreation as somehow automatically providing for local needs served as an ideological mask for the more significant political ends of using sport to maintain social order. The blandness of the term community contained in the general romantic use of the word to convey ideals about intimate social interaction seems also to have reinforced the attraction to it of sports administrators of contrasting political persuasions—from those who favoured liberal ideas of progress to those guided by market-led pragmatic approaches to planning for physical recreation. Some attempt was made by Rosemary Burton (1974) to distinguish between the different dimensions of 'community recreation' where the locality focus on provision of regional and neighbourhood facilities was differentiated from the social control significance of 'community

development', and radical Left thrust of 'community action' (137). But Burton's contribution, though useful, was not developed beyond the definitional level and a more extended critical analysis was required for an understanding of the political and ideological significance of connections between sport and a focus on community. Hargreaves (1986), who examined the relationship between participation in sport and power in society in the context of the state's intervention in 'rescuing the community' from mal-integration, provided a deeper perspective in which the link between community, order and social change can be analysed (138).

Three strands of political strategy can indeed be identified in the focus on community in sports policy since the 1960s which follow the distinct ideological positions outlined earlier in the chapter. These are firstly, a liberal-humanist and Labourist approach in which community was seen to be important to the state as a form of social integration, particularly in the 1960s and 1970s, in maintaining the political hegemony of social democracy; secondly, an emphasis on entrepreneurial initiative as a dimension of the market and competitive individualist themes of Thatcherism with its increasing focus on the inner cities in an attempt to ameliorate social problems of order, and to erode Labour's political base in the industrial areas; and thirdly, municipal socialism, in which a sense of community as empowerment has formed the basis of policies in some authorities working towards a radical socialism but with increasing centralist opposition. The significance of community in relation to corporate management and dual provision/use in the 1960/70s was underlined in earlier sections and the focus here will be to extend understanding of the role of 'community and sport' in the shift from social democracy to authoritarian populism from the mid-1970s to mid-1980s. In this context, although liberal-humanism,

entrepreneurialism and socialism are put forward as separate ideological projects, it is emphasised that the dominance of one may absorb the other at particular historical moments. Indeed, it has been argued earlier in the study that some of the themes of liberal-humanism were effectively incorporated into the ideological work of constructing a popular authoritarianism when Thatcherism was built around a free-market neo-liberalism and 'strong state' traditional conservative focus on duty and standards. Thus in the 1980s, central agencies of sport like the Sports Council and C.C.P.R. promoted community schemes conceived at an earlier period in a more social-democratic and liberal humanist climate, in the language of entrepreneurialism and a business common-sense (139). Stuart Hall refers to the way that the electoral success of Mrs. Thatcher has relied on constructing a social bloc of different interests to form an 'imaginary community' around Thatcherism's political project. He states,

In the second term, Thatcherism did not make a single move which was not also carefully calculated in terms of this hegemonic strategy. It stepped up the pace of privatisation. But it took care, at every step, to harness new social constituencies to it, to 'construct' an image of the new, share-owning working class, and to expand the bloc symbolically around, the image of choice (140).

The Thatcherist project also reached out to sport and its community focus. It resurrected and built on the conservatism and liberalism of the Wolfenden Committee's stress in 1960 on the values of 'standards', 'self-discipline', 'endurance' and 'self-reliance', which were seen by Wolfenden as inherent to sport and which lay behind attempts to encourage young adolescents to participate in it (141). It utilised and added to the instrumental approach adopted 1974-79 by the Labour Minister for Sport, Denis Howell, in which sport was called on to help resolve the problems of 'the inner cities and

other areas of social stress', and when government emphasised the importance of 'law and order' by taking a lead in devising methods to cope with the increase in disturbances of football supporters (142). It also adopted themes of 'self-help in the community' and of local authorities seeing themselves as 'assisters and enablers rather than as mere providers' put forward by Howell in 1977 to underline how much could be achieved for very little money. Indeed, the agenda on sport and community was actually set by social forces of the Right during the period of Labour power in the 1970s. It was then capitalised on and pushed further with the aggressive themes of a revived neo-liberalism which reinforced order, competition, self-interest and self-help.

As already indicated a major focus of this transformation from a consensus to authoritarian politics has been the inner-cities. These were subject to government-led urban experiments from the late 1960s, notably through the urban aid programme. The Labour Home Secretary, James Callaghan, argued in 1968 that there was a need for special intervention by public agencies on the grounds of addressing the problems of the disadvantaged (143). However, the involvement of the state in inner city development and the justification for this needs to be seen against a background of economic changes bringing about a shift to new technologies, deindustrialisation, and an increase in unemployment with particular effect on black minorities. The political responses to economic crisis followed by both Labour and Conservative administrations from the late 1960s to the 1980s were to find ways of coping with social disintegration and expressions of this, and how to manage the transition to new employment in inner cities. But the way the political policies have been conceived and applied in relation to inner cities have followed ideological lines which can be distinguished as social democratic,

entrepreneurial and egalitarian in orientation. The social democratic position drew on a traditional Fabian approach which was evident in Labour government policies on sport in the 1970s. Whilst the importance of assisting deprived areas was underlined, provision of recreation amenities was seen as a means of 'reducing boredom and urban frustration' with no mention of the control communities might wish to exert over their 'free-time' (White Paper on Sport and Recreation, 1975). Local authorities were regarded as the most appropriate mechanism for linking with communities, but this in itself did little to ensure that the communities everyday needs were met in regard to recreation, since those needs were interpreted in various ways, and were largely influenced by the dominant forces in the localities. In the West Midlands the recreation needs of communities in Solihull for instance were defined in terms of 'ability to pay' (144) and in Walsall, although a number of community schools were established, the control of facilities and programmes remained with headmasters (145). In Sandwell, needs were assessed by the subjective judgement of local authority staff of what was required (146). And in Birmingham although the Labour manifesto and Labour councillors upheld the slogan 'power to the people' the realisation of this was framed by a particular kind of 'school-based' Recreation Department 'management' model (147).

The entrepreneurial approach seen by the radical Right as an essential ingredient in developing a sense of market opportunities was 'sharpened-up' during Mrs. Thatcher's second term 1983-87. In relation to the inner-cities it was linked to an awareness that economic progress alone would not solve the Government's problems. Lord Young, Secretary of State for Employment, in 1986 indicated that an examination of how the Americans had tackled problems faced by the disadvantaged and blacks had shown that it was up to communities to

organise themselves. As indicated earlier in the chapter, self-reliance and personal initiative were consequently stressed as attitudes to encourage in a new 'people' oriented strategy of the Conservative Government which attempted to 'bring together the efforts of the local community, local government, the private sector and central government'. Task forces were set up in pilot areas which were said to be concerned with getting resources to the people that needed them. With regard to sport and recreation, schemes with similar objectives were initiated by the Government and central sports bodies (148). The 'Action Sport' campaign for London and the West Midlands launched by the Sports Council in 1982 in conjunction with the Manpower Services Commission, the C.C.P.R. Community Sports Leaders Award and other Sports Council-aided schemes like the Docklands Sports Bus Project were initiatives which adopted the 'task force' and 'outreach' methods of management in an effort to activate communities in the 1980s. However, the driving-force behind the 'people' philosophy presented by the Thatcher Government has been to pursue a populist, anti-statist though centralist and pro-market consensus. The concern about involving people should not be mistaken for giving communities real power or prospects for realistic choices for many; it was rather about instilling a sense of ownership in schemes and programmes as a means to incorporating other objectives. In elaborating on the theme of Inner Cities and the 'People' Philosophy, the Secretary of State for Employment also argued that the key to enterprise was the participation of the private sector, together with education in the values of 'respect' and 'good citizenship' and an awareness of how wealth was created. In declaring that the 'new' Conservative policy on inner cities was about a partnership with local people involving local business and voluntary groups, local authorities and community leaders an indication was given of the Thatcherist hegemonic strategy. The

significance of this approach to the inner cities lies in what Stuart Hall refers to as the building of a new social bloc symbolically by including as many different groups as possible in the political project (149). And the introduction of task force and outreach methods in sports projects to increase the number of consumers in recreation - particularly the unattached, women, ethnic minorities and unemployed - was linked to the wider political purpose of providing access to urban communities as a means of adhering them to the increasingly dominant order framed by entrepreneurialism. As John Hargreaves (1986) points out, sports leadership schemes which operate on the basis of working through peer groups

afford dominant groups entry to communities normally closed to bureaucratised forms of intervention, and opportunities for exercising influence and leadership that are not seen as being imposed from above (150).

However, the extent to which working class communities are influenced by middle-class missionary zeal remains questionable.

A third position, of egalitarianism as a focus on inequality and the disadvantaged, has roots in traditional Labourism, and indeed with the social democratic/liberal-humanist emphasis of the 1974-79 Labour Government. However, egalitarian objectives also formed the basis for the political project of some urban local authorities in the 1980s which were concerned with attempting to mobilise democratic power on a more popular basis. Although authorities like the Greater London Council, the Inner London Education authority and Sheffield have been abolished or undermined by the forces of the radical Right, the efforts made to involve communities in a range of schemes and to connect with different interest groups with a view to directly confronting the sources of inequalities did provide some experience of how a radical socialist programme could be developed. By focusing

on race, gender and social class, and by linking up with business and commerce, statutory agencies and voluntary bodies in a way which required their agreement to positive discrimination towards disadvantaged groups, some developments were made in community action which set out to empower people in their cultural activities. Sport and Recreation formed a significant branch of the total scheme with the Greater London Council. But as Gramsci emphasised, the maintenance and challenge to hegemony is a continuing process which has to be worked for. Whilst the forces of the radical Right in the 1980s were more successful than the Left in the political strategy of transforming social democracy and absorbing sport and recreation along with other areas of life into the political configuration of free market values, the possibilities of challenging and resisting the domination of authoritarian populism need also to be considered. The way the Conservative Government has handled and continues to develop policies in the 1980s towards the alienated population of the inner cities is significant in the hegemonic struggle. Indeed, as Hargreaves argues, the volatile situation of the inner cities demonstrated by the series of explosions from Toxteth in 1981 to Tottenham in 1985 and then in Bristol and Plymouth in 1986, highlights the difficulties of integrating a population which has never experienced the discipline of work, nor been able to enjoy reasonable access to consumption because of limited incomes. In this context sport and recreation may

instead of accommodating them to the social order, be experienced as one more dimension of deprivation and alienation (151).

The specific strategies adopted in the shift from social-democracy to popular authoritarianism, in which participation in community sport and recreation was utilised in the neo-liberal emphasis on law and order, involved gaining public support for firm

action, identifying and mounting an attack on the moral deficiencies of the consensus period of the 1960s and early 1970s, providing mechanisms to dampen down resistance to poor social conditions in urban areas whilst appearing to be offering increased resources, and adopting a more rigorous policing of public spaces in the cities. In 1977, Denis Howell, by appealing to genuine football supporters for understanding in plans for more stringent measures of supervision and control of grounds in order to stamp out the 'minority hooligan element', was, in effect, seeking to gain popular support for greater state controls (152). The issue of football hooliganism was also fabricated into a multi-faceted state of panic with a report in 1977 by the West Yorkshire Metropolitan Police Authority, which reviewed the general situation in terms of the 'permissive society', declining moral standards, effects of pop groups, violence on television and the devaluation of legal penalties and moral censure, before turning to specific factors such as alcohol, the impressionism of immature youth to media persuasion, the search for a sense of identity etc. (153). The 'moral panic' surrounding football hooliganism was indeed kept to the forefront in the law and order emphasis of the post 1979 Thatcher governments which were concerned to give the 'swing to the right' a more powerful impetus. Part of the strategy was to construct an image in which Thatcherism was seen by the public to stand for responsibility, order and family discipline in contrast to the indulgence indicative of the lack of moral, and political purpose associated with the social democratic consensus. In this context, the Sports Council's concentration on family recreation and tackling the problems of social unrest and unemployment through community leadership schemes signifies an adaptation of sports policy to the dominance of the changing ideological and political project of the radical Right (154). This approach was reinforced by Conservative Ministers of Sport. Neil Macfarlane, for example, on the

behaviour of British football fans abroad and the marketing of the British image, referred to the attempts to 're-establish a good reputation', 'restoring the game in this country to its pre-eminent position of the 1950's and 'trying to restore national pride'. The recent past was presented in ways which highlighted the nature and extent of the social problems and that they could be overcome by tighter organisation, more inspired leadership, greater co-ordination and sharing, and above all a 'business' approach (155).

The riots of the 1980s accentuated the focus of attention of the government and other statutory bodies on the inner-cities, and the role of sport and recreation provision became more significant as its scope for preventing crime and civil disturbance was recognised by civil servants and government ministers. Indeed, the Sports Council as a statutory agency accommodated its policies opportunistically to the scope for special funding and 'made proposals to Government for a large-scale community sports leadership scheme' but it is the political and ideological outcomes of the ensuing debates and policy measures which need to be stressed in relation to the theme already outlined of the radical Right project (156). Of particular importance was the way in which provision for sport and recreation assisted in diverting attention from the social conditions of the disadvantaged in inner cities, and of how it was used to reinforce the market thrust through private sector involvement in social policy.

Two events set the scene for these developments, the Scarman Inquiry set up by the Home Office following the Brixton disorders 10-12 April 1981, and the Merseyside Initiative of Michael Heseltine, the Secretary of State for the Environment, which resulted from the Toxteth riots of 1981. Under the section of the Scarman report

addressing the social conditions of Brixton, and the environment in particular, the absence of facilities for leisure and recreation was cited as a factor contributing to the unrest. The report stated

It is clear that opportunities do not at present exist for young people in Brixton to the extent that they ought, particularly given the enforced idleness of many youths through unemployment. The amusement arcades, the unlawful drinking clubs and, I believe, the criminal classes gain as a result. The street corners become the social centres of people, young and old, good and bad, with time on their hands and a continuing opportunity, which, doubtless, they use, to engage in endless discussion of their grievances (157).

This statement indeed revealed the dual position taken by Lord Scarman - a liberalism with humanist and manipulative dimensions. For although it was recommended elsewhere in the report that local communities must be fully and effectively involved in planning, in the provision of local services and in the management and financing of specific projects, and throughout the examination the existence of unemployment was deplored, nevertheless, the social control purpose of recreation was made manifest. Recreational facilities were considered to be important as a means of keeping the unemployed occupied - and, indeed, distracted from the realities of their plight in the sense that time to discuss ways of overcoming their grievances was viewed with alarm. The alternative of socially acceptable opportunities - the provided form of traditional recreation - was presented as a diversion from criminal ends. A contradiction here is that drinking and amusement form a significant part of the leisure industries which have been increasingly marketed by commerce with support from the state, and are seen to be acceptable activities in other settings. A further limitation is that Scarman's analysis of the Brixton riots tended to assume a pluralist model of society in which plans to resolve the problems of inner cities - and the place

of recreation within this - were conceived in reformist terms. But as argued in the opening Chapter in assessing Roberts' approach to the growth of leisure, the pluralist perspective is problematic. For although it may focus on the provision of resources for the disadvantaged, it also stands for the maintenance of liberal freedoms which retain power in the hands of the stronger interest groups. In the political climate of the 1980s with a Conservative and progressively authoritarian and centralist Government, the recommendations of the Scarman Inquiry could be used to pursue a reinforcement of individualist and entrepreneurial values whilst accepting that resources needed to be provided in inner-cities to defuse urban unrest. They could thus be seen to be meeting community needs through, for instance, sport and recreation amenities, but in ways that helped strengthen the political project of Thatcherism and maintained the subordination of the working class to dominant forces, particularly those of the market. This process was advanced by the Merseyside Initiative in which the Secretary of State for the Environment, Michael Heseltine, made £1 million available for sports facilities on the condition that it was matched pound-for-pound by funds from private or voluntary sources. The Sports Council was asked to administer the scheme and acted for the Secretary of State in raising the money and directing the funds to target groups (158), thereby signalling an extension and tightening of control of sports policy by the state.

This authoritarian stance was also evident in more direct and indirect policing where sport was identified as an area to exploit by police authorities in relation to their 'Social Policy and Crime Prevention' thrust. In 1983, Metropolitan Police Commissioner, Sir Kenneth Newman, regarded sport as a useful means of shifting the onus for crime prevention back to the community and claimed that progress

had already been made in this direction (159). He indicated that by 1981, almost 50,000 young people participated in the Metropolitan Policy Youth Soccer Tournament, and many schemes were reported to be run on a local basis with police officers acting as catalysts for action by arranging summer play activities and competitions based on such sports as cricket, darts, netball and fishing. Newman claimed that many thousands of youngsters had become involved in constructive activities, diverting them from the possibilities of criminal pursuit, bringing policemen and young people together in non-abrasive encounters, identifying new venues for the utilisation of sport and helping to establish new clubs run by parents. In the West Midlands 'Football in the Community' experiments in 1979 at Wolverhampton F.C. and West Bromwich Albion F.C. links with the police were also established in the operation of a scheme in which it was reported that

literally thousands of children and youths, including problem children and many unemployed youngsters, were involved in coaching courses, team games and training (160).

The strategy behind the increasing interest of police authorities with community sport was made clear in Newman's statement that

our involvement in sporting and leisure activities has provided the service with numerous platforms on which we can help to educate the public on the problems facing the police ... It helps inculcate values such as self-help, discipline, responsibility and being a good neighbour. Unfashionable as these terms may be, they refer to qualities which will promote a better quality of life for all of us (161).

But far from being unfashionable these values became the popular slogans of the radical Right as Thatcherism extended its ideological work in the 1980s with the help of such campaigns as police

involvement in sport. Whereas in the 1950s and 1960s sports organisation and coaching was the province of trained physical educationists and physical recreationists, by the later 1970s it had become an interest not only for recreation managers but for those concerned with social order, like probation officers, social workers and secretaries of social clubs as well as the police force. This development is an indication of the ideological purposes to which leisure has been utilised. As Clarke and Critcher point out,

The efforts, to repress and exclude 'undesirable' uses of free time and the attempt to replace them with leisure patterns which are civilising and profitable has been a continuous part of the development of leisure in Britain (162).

A much publicised experiment, which aimed to attract those who had not responded to the standard sports centres, was the 'Action Sport' campaign promoted by the Sports Council in conjunction with the Manpower Services Commission. In the Spring of 1982, the Sports Council announced details of a £3 million inner city campaign for London and the West Midlands which would assist the unemployed and create at least fifty new jobs (163). With regard to the West Midlands, £½ million each year was to be injected into six projects in the areas of Birmingham, Coventry, Sandwell, Dudley, Wolverhampton and Walsall. Certainly a different approach was adopted compared to the traditional pattern of leadership by the Sports Council. The stated intention was for the pyramid of responsibility to be inverted (as far as possible), so that instead of a central system of direction and common practice, the Action Sport staff (sports leaders, motivators, street corner workers) were seen as those with most knowledge of the target groups and would be backed up and supported by the local authority recreation staff and the Action Sport Directorate (based at the West Midlands Regional Sports

Council (164). However, even where the West Midlands sports projects were successful in obtaining continuing support and some further success in increasing participation in sport was achieved, it has to be questioned whether this process was not merely assisting capital to more effectively control a basically disenchanted and alienated young unemployed population in many parts of the West Midlands - like other inner cities. In addition, although its aims were to reverse the structures of authority, it was still dependent on initiatives and handouts from above, either through the central state or local state. It can hardly be said to be an example of social ownership of sport. The Action Sport scheme in becoming linked to local authority structures puts itself in a position to be dominated by the statist form of provision. Whilst the intention of some of the Action Sport staff may have been to understand and use the local authority system for the benefit of the deprived, the bureaucratic structures and values taken by most authorities in the West Midlands, through which it operated, limited the thrust of any egalitarian objectives (165).

There is a further important point, which relates to the extent to which the operation of government-led experiments have actually penetrated to the working class youth for whom they were intended. Although by 1983/84 the West Midlands Action Sport scheme was reported to have involved 6,000 participants per week, this was only a small percentage of the young adult population of the region, many of whom - particularly the unemployed - rejected or were unable to take advantage of organised youth activities of any kind (166). Involving Asian groups was also a particular problem for Action Sports Leaders (167). In addition, a number of the leaders of community schemes appeared not to be very aware of the social purposes and values of involving young people in sport (168). The values of self-help, initiative and discipline associated with participation in sport were not automatically understood by leaders or transmitted to clients.

Indeed, state intervention in sport appeared not to accommodate dominant and subordinate groups in any uniform way and in a number of cases not very effectively. However, whilst the social conditions which maintained disadvantage in urban communities altered very little in the 1980s, there does appear to have been a strengthening of the radical right political project through the publicity afforded to state provision for sport and recreation.

The way in which provision for the unemployed and disadvantaged was alternatively conceived by statist/administrative approaches as distinct from cultural analysis/policy research in the West Midlands highlights the polarisation of liberal/radical Right and democratic socialist ideological and political perspectives. Whereas the West Midlands Sports Council was concerned with demonstrating that participation in sport can combat 'anti-social behaviour' and lead to a 'decline in the number of cases taken before the judiciary', (169) the Youth Review Team based at Wolverhampton Civic Centre under the leadership of Paul Willis focused on understanding the 'social condition' of youth unemployment and changing the local authority policy to facilitate the extension and liberation of the powers of their clients rather than to maintain a passive containment (170). The Regional Sports Council's concentration on 'Action Sport' and community projects emphasised the importance of 'inspired leadership'. The Wolverhampton Youth Team, in contrast, started with the inspiration of C.Wright Mills' statement that

Both the correct statement of the problem and the range of possible solutions require us to consider the economic and political institutions of the society, and not merely the personal situation and character of a scatter of individuals (171).

The Sports Council seemed more interested in containing the effects of social change, whilst the Willis project emphasised the need for deeper and wider understanding. Indeed the Youth Team Report (1985) which was formally endorsed by Wolverhampton Borough Council, stressed the importance not only of mitigating the effects of change within a given framework, but of a strategy of managing change through adaptation of the institutions of the local state in a way which maximised the autonomies and powers of those unduly affected by change. The Sports Council started from the position of sports provision and proceeded to justify it on social grounds of offering activities for the unemployed, but Willis argued that while greater leisure opportunities, detached youth workers etc. were all necessary, the major concern should be to address 'central life problems' - of unemployment rather than the unemployed. As he pointed out

The provision of leisure, recreation, and cultural activities is important, of course, but the opportunities will not be taken-up anyway by wide sections of the youth population unless they are located in a general social and political programme linking many sites and provisions through information and networking and addressed to the promotion of an overall philosophy of the emancipation of youth and the development of their rights. The Local Authority, or some part of it, must be seen to be 'on the side' of young people (172).

The Youth Team Report confirms the findings of investigations undertaken by the author of Wolverhampton's public provision between 1978-84, particularly of the lack of integration and co-ordination of departmental services and of the limited identification of community needs. But it also clearly indicates for the authority the direction required for a radical socialism and that it should take into account the need not only to service the needs of youth but to undertake a role of political, economic and social advocacy for youth and its

sub-sections to combat the inequality and injustices they face. The Sports Council as government agency, and those local authority departments which merely provide sport and recreation either opportunistically or to meet and contain the effects of social change, tend to provide a service which is incorporated into the dominant political hegemony. In the 1980s this has been defined by the radical Right Thatcherist authoritarian project.

This chapter has concentrated on the ways in which the local state has become a key force in the provision of sport and recreation since the 1960s examining the political and ideological significance of this development and assessing the degree to which national policy has been interpreted at local level. It is apparent that the local arm of the state became significant for government as a means of support for the changing requirements of capital, but in very different political contexts, and it is the attempt to understand the fundamental dimensions of the political framework and strategies and how these changed from the 1960s to the 1980s that has underpinned analysis and interpretation of the place of sport at local level. This hinged on the political projects of building a social democratic consensus in the 1960s and early 1970s, followed by the break with consensus and tradition to an authoritarian radical Right from the mid 1970s. The social democratic movement was characterised by investment in the local sector with a commitment to reorganise local government, to implement corporate planning and to regenerate urban areas. An ideological thrust of efficiency in co-ordination and management was coupled with a community and 'law and order' approach in changing relationships with the public which, in practice, reinforced the gap between the dominant and subordinate

groups and inequalities of class, gender and race. The organisation of sport and recreation both assisted and was conditioned by this corporate movement. It contributed to the hegemony of social democracy through involvement in corporate management and planning, but it opportunistically sought to benefit from it, largely through increases in facility provision. Sport and recreation became closely tied in to government welfare policies in the process. The corporate planning and management emphasis actually failed to identify groups who would gain or lose. By focusing on efficient administrative processes to the neglect of social conditions of communities and the powerlessness of ordinary people, sport in the local state helped to maintain inequalities rather than overcome them. But despite central government pressure towards corporate planning and management developments the implementation of this in some respects at local level proved intractable. This was particularly evident over the difficulties of persuading authorities to adopt joint-provision and dual-use principles for wider use of schools, where the tensions between education and recreation were apparent. Education authorities and interests both resisted and re-interpreted the pressures for 'sharing' to their own advantage. In addition, although in some Labour authorities where dual provision/use was eagerly adopted and where there appeared to be a concern about social conditions, because an essentially liberal-humanist approach was adopted in which the source of inequalities were not located in the social structure, the effect was to minimise real gains in the power of working-class groups to manage their lives in a context of high unemployment.

It has been argued that both corporate planning and management and joint-schemes as an aspect of the corporate strategy became reconstructed and transformed with the break-up of the social-democratic consensus and the transition to a radical Right

politics. The Thatcher Governments from 1979 reinforced the shift to the Right making this a populist and authoritarian ideological movement. Local authorities were attacked and pressurised into reducing the scale of local spending through, for example, selling off recreational land and putting out a number of sports facilities to competitive tender. At the same time the focus on inner-cities was used both to contain urban unrest with 'community' sport being given particular meaning in relation to a 'law and order' concentration, and to promote an entrepreneurial consciousness and commitment. It appeared that Labour socialist attempts to intervene in this process were progressively incorporated because of the relative inadequacy of their ideological and political thrust, and because their analysis of social change was inappropriately conceived in terms of containment, with sport and recreation playing an increasingly significant part.

The scope for counter-hegemonic development has also been demonstrated, notably in the practical municipal socialism of the Greater London Council, in which sport and recreation was included in a political approach which embraced a wide area of economic, social and cultural provision, and in the cultural analysis of the social condition of young people in Wolverhampton, which attempted to shift the consciousness of local politicians and re-orientate traditional Labourism to radical socialism. In the latter project leisure, sport and recreation provision was seen to be important only if integrated into a more general social and political programme addressed to the promotion of an overall philosophy of the emancipation of youth.

CHAPTER FIVE

SPORT, BUSINESS AND THE STATE

The links between business and sport were outlined in the opening chapter through the notion of sport as a product, the growth of a market approach in Sports Council policies, and an ideology emphasising social motives for investment in sport. Business and commercial interest in sport have indeed grown considerably since the 1960s with marked effects on the way that sport is organised by governing bodies, communicated by the media and conceived by the public. Sports organisations clamour for T.V. coverage to attract sponsors, the media reconstructs sport as entertainment, and the public seem to become less discerning and more accepting of the concentration on super-stars and the banners of large business firms. Interest in sport as a cultural phenomenon has also attracted the interest of academics as it has become apparent that capitalism has incorporated leisure more visibly as a form of economic and cultural domination. The growth in the number and frequency of national and international competitive events, which underpins and reflects media and commercial interest, has traditionally been represented in sporting folk-history as a natural development in making sport more available to a wider group of athletes and members of the public. Such a view accords with the autonomous, independent and neutral image of sport and its connection with a liberal tradition of progress in which growth in participation in sporting activities, and increased standards of achievement were assumed to be a good thing because sport was inherently valuable. However, as 'the social reproduction' perspective of Brohm (1978) emphasised, the increasing commercial links with sport can also be explained as a phenomenon reflecting the pressure of economic, political, diplomatic and military institutions which may indeed be set up to profit from sport (1).

Certainly world-wide events like the Olympic Games since the 1960s have constituted a vast commercial enterprise as well as a sporting phenomenon which bring in considerable profits for the organisers and the public and private promoters who provide the finance. By the 1972 Munich Olympics

commercial activities included items like national lottery tickets, sale of television rights, issuing of Olympic coins, Olympic stamps, sale of licences for commercial use of the Olympic emblems and Olympic souvenirs. Dakin (1972) pointed out that

nearly 250 companies paid more than £2½ million simply for the privilege of using the Olympic symbol. International giants like General Motors, Ford, IBM, Kodak, Hoover and the Xerox Corporation were among the first. These were followed by makers of products as diverse as clothes, beer mugs, post-cards, brandy glasses, brief cases, dolls, necklaces and carpets Two German manufacturers of track shoes - Puma and Adidas - who were said to have paid runners £30,000 to wear their shoes in the Mexico games are expected to fight it out again (2).

And although the Montreal Games of 1976 were widely reported to be a 'financial disaster', the commitment of sports bodies to commercial values was even more apparent in the organisation of the Los Angeles Olympic Games of 1984 which were described by Conservative Minister for Sport, Neil Macfarlane, as the ultimate example of what could be achieved from sports sponsorship. He stated that

The Los Angeles Organising Committee Chairman decided to demand a minimum from each major sponsor of 4 million dollars ... They were sponsorships of huge proportions that enabled the Los Angeles Games to make a surplus of 225 million dollars .. (3).

It is also clear from both Sports Council and Central Council of Physical Recreation documents, and journals like Sports Industry and Leisure Management, that there has been a growing consciousness of the scale of commercial activity in sport, and a desire to further this trend (4). In 1983, the Sports Council estimated that there existed in Britain in 1980 a sports market of some £770 million for goods and equipment, commercial sponsorship of between £10 million and £65 million and total consumer spending on sport of £1,000 million (5). By 1987, the Sports Council announced that

sponsorship of sport exceeded £146 million a year, that it continued to grow unabated, that its own Sponsorship Advisory Service was firmly established as an objective means of bringing business and sport closer together, and that they had decided to employ a commercial manager to develop and co-ordinate the Council's business activities (6).

The significance of the connection between business and sport was traced by Clarke and Critcher (1985) through underlining not only the increasing scale of sponsorship, but also the incorporation of sport as an adjunct of the advertising industry. They argued that leisure and sport have become central to capitalist economic and cultural domination. A key point in their analysis, which penetrates further than liberal or social reproduction interpretations in identifying the likely effects of business involvement, is that the illusion of sport as independent from the rest of social life may be undermined. For the increasing links between sport and commerce highlights the way in which leisure and sport are becoming

subjected more visibly to the
power and control of the economic
organisations which shape the reality
of our working lives (7).

A further paradox, as indicated in Chapter One in discussion of Hargreaves' work is that the increasing commercialisation of sport may also have the effect of reducing its power to legitimise and accommodate participants and audiences if the play element is frustrated and eroded through the transformations taking place in producing sport as an entertainment spectacle (8). An important point to consider here is whether the cultural changes being brought about by commercial involvement in sport may actually lead to alienation and discontent with scope for an oppositional meaning and purpose for business links with sport, or whether business sponsorship will continue to reinforce compliance to capitalist notions of the market. Fred Inglis (1977) captured the range and diversity of meaning and levels in sport, displaying a deep affection for the exhilaration to be found in participation, but recognising that the enormous extension of the entertainment industry had

changed the whole structure of sport, most obviously on television, and complicated the economics of sport, as much as anything by strengthening and distributing the super-star system. Inglis represents sport as a mixture of popular culture which is marked by its contrary pulls in two directions: towards the manipulation and towards the expression, of real feelings and ideas (9).

Developments in the commercialisation of sport since the late 1970s would appear to have increased the manipulative tendencies. Business sponsorship has, for instance, changed the official language of both the arts and sports in the 1980s. As Hewison (1987) in The Heritage Industry pointed out,

The Minister for the Arts speaks of 'the delivery of the art product' to 'consumers of art'. This language has been enthusiastically embraced by the Arts Council ... which presented its bid for increased government funding in 1986/87 in terms of a business prospectus ... The new emphasis is not on encouraging artists but marketing the arts, indeed, in marketing the Arts Council ... The arts are not seen to be the means by which a society engages in a critical dialogue to tease out the values by which it might live. They are not even for enjoyment. They are for investment ... The arts are no longer appreciated as a source of inspiration, of ideas, images or values, they are part of the 'leisure business'. We are no longer lovers of art, but customers for a product. And as the marketing managers of the heritage industry get into full swing, the goods that we are being offered become more and more spurious, and the quality of life more and more debased (10).

Whilst Hewison vividly captures the shift to a market idiom he also seems to imply that the arts were once (before the intrusion of a business ethos in the 1980s) a more civilised and inspirational sphere of culture, but it needs to be recognised that they were subject to a different but as pervasive a form of cultural privilege and domination which depended on the patronage of individuals and government funding. It is not that the arts were more open and accessible to all social classes, but that they were less subject to market values. What seems to have happened is that the arts along with other cultural and social forms of provision have been markedly shaped by the

ideological and political forces of the radical Right since the late 1970s. The Conservative Ministers for Sport, Hector Munro 1979-82, and Neil Macfarlane, 1982-85, were also forthright about the importance of sponsorship for sport (11), and as already indicated, the Sports Council increasingly emphasised its interest and involvement in 'marketing', 'partnership with the commercial sector', 'investment' and 'worthwhile returns' (12). The language of business was indeed also evident in sport.

However the involvement of business in sport and the closer relationships between government, the Sports Council and commercial interests were not achieved without raising tensions, anomalies and contradictions. Indeed, a number of contentious issues can be identified in the growth of sponsorship of sport since the 1960s which will form a framework for this chapter. Firstly, it has become evident that the gap between elite and mass sport has widened. Exposure of the sponsor by the media has been a major factor in determining which sports qualified for business investment. The Enquiry into Sports Sponsorship set up by the C.C.P.R. in 1982 under the Chairmanship of Denis Howell revealed that considerable sums of money were directed to elite sport and sports which attracted spectators either on site or in front of television sets, and that comparatively little money went to the rest of sport (13). The Howell Committee also indicated that whilst between 1981 and 1983 there were 125 instances of sponsorship of youth sport this only represented 0.2% of the total estimated expenditure by sponsors of sport (14). A typical response to this unequal provision, advocated by Conservative and Labour Party spokesmen for sport and by the C.C.P.R. and Sports Council has been to encourage greater sponsorship at the local level. But this is also problematic for it reinforces the closer involvement of business with communities in a particular way. Inglis (1977) conveyed the underlying significance of this 'natural' response in stating that

sponsorship is part of a frame of mind, a state of consciousness in the culture. For when we in the West look for patrons, we turn naturally

to industry rather than to the sources and resources of social wealth. What we provide for ourselves is called the welfare state. At best, it lives in perpetual rivalry with the central dynamos of the giant companies; at worst, the state is pushed out into a broad, dismal margin around the foreground which capital commands, and which is filled with the rich prizes commended to us by its advertising agents (15).

Questions arise from these insights of Inglis which need to be addressed, for it appears that community resources are hived off to elites through a capitalist mechanism for sponsorship. If this is the essence of values about sponsorship in capitalist society, why and how have these attitudes been constructed in sport, and what alternatives or oppositional approaches can be conceived in relations between state and business?

Secondly, the association of sport with unhealthy practices like smoking, through the heavy involvement of tobacco firms in sports sponsorship, has raised ethical problems which have become magnified as the debate about the conflict between 'health' and 'wealth' sharpened in the 1980s. Indeed, the political and economic mechanisms of the power of tobacco involve sport in crucial ways. As Peter Taylor (1984) argued, not only does the tobacco industry have enormous power, but it has cultivated its political and social connections astutely over the years, particularly through sponsorship of sport and the arts. He pointed out that in this way

it seeks to present an image of untainted respectability and to integrate itself with leading national institutions (16).

However, in recent years with the intensification of the campaigns by the Royal College of Physicians, successive Health Ministers, and Action on Smoking and Health (ASH) the link between sport and tobacco sponsorship has revealed strains within the hierarchy of sports administration. On the one hand, politicians like Denis Howell and Neil Macfarlane have argued strongly for the retention of tobacco sponsorship on financial and ideological grounds, asserting that without sponsorship from tobacco firms sport would not survive,

and that individual sports bodies should be 'free' to decide from whom they would accept sponsorship (17). On the other hand, Minister for Sport 1985-87, Richard Tracey, was known to be actively working against tobacco sponsorship, and the Sports Council in 1986 declared that it would not itself, under any circumstances, accept tobacco sponsorship (18). The Sports Council also held that sports which were dependent on such sponsorship should take vigorous action to secure alternative funding. McIntosh and Charlton (1985) highlight the issues in relating tobacco sponsorship to the principles of 'Sport for All'. They point out:

One of the stated aims of Sport for All is to improve health and one of its stated objectives is to reduce the incidence of coronary heart disease. Smoking is known to impair health and is responsible for the very great increase of coronary heart disease. Can sponsorship of sport by the tobacco industry be reconciled with the achievement of that aim and that objective? ... The commercial advantage of sports sponsorship to the tobacco industry is difficult to assess but the tax revenue to the government in 1982 was £4,207 million. The ethical problem is everyone's concern (19).

However, despite the arguments being presented for a break with tobacco sponsorship there are counter movements in the politics of sport to retain the links. Peter Taylor, in his book The Smoke Ring referred to the ring of political and economic interests which has protected the tobacco industry for the past twenty years. He maintained that governments were themselves part of the Smoke Ring for hard economic reasons, and that although politicians may invoke freedom of choice in defence of their inactivity, in practice they were seduced into the Smoke Ring by economic facts. Ministers who resist this by counter action have apparently been relieved from their posts (20). Sponsorship of sport is part of this Smoke Ring and despite some government restrictions it continues to function in the late 1980s, pointing up the anomalies of sport being associated with a lethal product.

Thirdly, it is apparent that the growth of commercial interests has spawned a new breed of sports agencies which threaten to undermine the

autonomy, or at least increasingly set the parameters for policy making, of the formal governing bodies of sport. One of the most powerful sports agents, Mark McCormack, gave an indication in 1984 of the nature and scope of sports agencies in his claim to be the pioneer of the agency business. As he maintained:

In the early 1960s I founded a company with less than 500 dollars in capital and thereby gave birth to an industry - the sports management and sports marketing industry. Today, that company has grown into the International Management Group (IMG), with offices around the world and several hundred million dollars in annual revenues ... Our television division produces hundreds of hours of original network programming throughout the world and sells thousands more hours for such clients as Wimbledon, The National Football League, the U.S. Tennis and Golf Associations, the World Ski Federation etc ... We represent, or have represented entities as diverse as the Nobel Foundation, the Vatican, and the English Catholic Church, and we are television consultants for the Organising Committees for the 1988 Calgary Winter Olympics and the 1988 Summer Olympics in Seoul, Korea (21).

There are a number of other similar multi-national sports agencies including Adidas, the West Nally Group, and Pro-Serv, who with IMG have been brought to task for exerting extensive power over players and events. The Howell Report' (1983) drew attention to the interlocking interests between international sports federations and sports marketing organisations, raising questions about how much power sponsors should wield over sport and indicating that profit seeking agencies, on some occasions, represented not only sport but also the commercial companies taking advantage of sporting occasions (22). Macfarlane (1986) pointed out that in 1985 Mark McCormack and two other sports agents were accused of restraint of trade and conspiracy by the governing body of men's tennis, the Men's International Professional Tennis Council. It is reported that the Council claimed that through the coercive use of their power to run exhibitions at the same time as tournaments, Pro Serv and IMG had been able to seize control or have a substantial financial interest in at least twenty-four of the thirty-seven major tournaments, plus many other events in the 1984 Nabisco Grand Prix (23). Although this particular case related to

established professional sport, the link between agencies and governing bodies has extended to what were predominantly amateur organisations like athletics and snooker as they have grown since the 1970s through television exposure. Tensions between the traditional governing bodies of sport and the new sports agencies have thus become evident, and signify another form of the infiltration of the organisation and presentation of sport by business and commerce. However, the nature of the relationship between sports agencies and sports organisations needs to be further examined. How different are the objectives of sponsors and agencies from the range of sports organisations? What kind of solutions are offered by sports bodies to counter the encroachment of business and how far do these represent similar or oppositional values? How effective are the measures of sports organisations in relation to business interests?

A fourth issue and one which has already been alluded to, concerns the scope for an oppositional conception of sport in a society which is increasingly dominated by business and market values, and where the penetration of sport at elite levels, via sponsorship, by commercial organisations has seen it become a vehicle of the advertising, promotion and market industries. Atkinson (1983) argued for intervention by local authorities to

make some resistance to the susceptibility of sport to financial dictates, consumer pressures, sexist ideologies and selective definitions which commercial organisations put on sport (24).

He suggested several possible areas for attention for the Greater London Council, including a strategy to counter the selective nature of commercial sponsorship of sport in London by seeking out sponsors or entering into sponsorship arrangements for local sports clubs and events, women's and ethnic minority sports, and by concentrating its own funding efforts on less privileged sports and people. Whannel (1983) also identified a new popular enthusiasm for fitness and exercise, of fun-running and people's marathons

which took the spotlight off star performers, broke down the normal distinction between the elite and the grass roots, and emphasised mutual support rather than competition. The involvement of sponsors could then be used for more egalitarian ends (25). However, the forces of the radical Right and commercialism in the 1980s have shown their strength and capacity for appropriation. The Greater London Council itself has been abolished, and as Whannel pointed out

The marathon business has become very commercialised too. Trade names emblazon everything that moves. Public relations firms jostle to get their clients on the screen. Application forms for the London marathon are accompanied by an enclosed leaflet advertising New Balance Shoes, a firm owned by two of the marathon organisers ... In a capitalist society any popular leisure activity is also going to be highly commercialised. Change within sport alone cannot have dramatic results. But if a more humane, more egalitarian and less oppressive form of sport is worth fighting for, then it is important to examine the existing organisation of sport and possible alternatives (26).

But in practice the images of sport as supportive of market values were being reinforced by the political Right under Thatcherism. In 1987, the Conservative Secretary of State for Education, Kenneth Baker, acclaimed sport for the potential it offered for 'enterprise' and the earning of huge sums of money. Mr. Baker made positive reference to the competitive approach of sport in the context of addressing the Leeds Chamber of Commerce in January 1987 on the need to sell the virtues of commerce to those in education, and to reverse what he considered to be a set of feelings, in some schools and in some institutions of higher education, amounting at times to a national prejudice against enterprise and the creation of wealth. In his statement reported by the Department of Education and Science he asserted that

Nobody is more positive about winning than those on a Saturday afternoon who cheer their team as it tries to win promotion, or even avoid relegation. Would that we could tap and build upon that determination and translate it into national attitudes towards work and the greatest international competition of all - the battles of trade and commerce (27).

Sport was thus used ideologically to make a point in selling the entrepreneurial culture.

The tensions and contradictions identified above will be analysed more fully in the following sections. In this task, I shall start from the entrepreneurial business initiatives and patronage approach of the 1950s and argue that this reflected and reinforced a pluralist position of sport which became transformed through the emergence of corporate interests and requirements with the growth of international sport, media impact and the penetration of multi-national firms. The role of sports agencies as an intervening force will be examined, making problematic the assumption that sport cannot exist without sponsorship and the guidance of professional business advice. The creation of new sporting events as an adjunct to business interest and profit will be analysed, and the dual role of sport - in promoting business but also as attempting to control it - assessed. The ambivalence and dilemma of the sports establishment will be considered in the context of liberal-humanist sentiments combining with practices of capital gain. In addition, I shall investigate how and with what effects the methods and ethics of sponsorship are extended to a mass clientele through clubs, schools and other local settings.

The Shift from Patronage to Corporate Interests and Requirements

Patronage of sport by business as a relatively altruistic activity was gradually replaced during the 1960s by the more commercial relationship of sponsorship, where companies provided financial or material resources in return for the benefits of some facility or privilege which resulted in publicity. Sponsorship on a wide scale is indeed a recent and developing phenomenon. In 1971, the Sports Council estimated the amount spent on sponsorship of sport by business to be approximately £2.5 million and in 1986 they indicated that it was approximately £150 million (28). To assess the meaning and significance of this trend for business and sport an examination

will be made of the structural changes in sport seen against economic, political and ideological influences and of the implications of these changes for the character and organisation of sporting activities themselves.

Inglis points out that up to the late 1950s the economic structures in sport were confined within the classical 19th century capitalist form of a straight commodity and market economy with free-market competition and low growth rates in, for example, the two dominant types of mass-spectator sport - football and cricket. But, he argues, though football clubs were limited liability companies, it was not usual for them to pay a dividend, and the paradox existed of many people being prepared to put a great deal of capital into sports clubs with little expectation of return (29). An examination of the financial basis of sport in the mid-1950s by the P.E. Department, Birmingham University, concluded that in Britain sport was largely financed in an unco-ordinated fashion by local voluntary effort. Business houses and firms did contribute, but these were generally modest sums and usually in response to appeals. For the Commonwealth Games in Vancouver in 1954, the bulk of the money was raised by a public appeal in which 47,500 letters and 42,400 subscription lists realised about £13,500 from business, £6,500 by the governing bodies of sports and other sporting associations, and approximately £14,500 by means of special functions (30). A pluralism of many sports with no particular direction from government or business can be said to have been the pattern of the 1950s. Although business was certainly interested in sport through exploiting the markets for goods and equipment, and in the betting industry, little was provided for sport by business. Attempts made to extract more from industry for sport through making a case for percentage of profits from football pools were eschewed by the liberal-dominated Wolfenden Committee on moral as much as practical grounds (see Chapter Three). In the 1950s, mass sport relied largely on voluntary effort and patronage, with a modest amount of government aid. Patrons of sport included King George's Jubilee Trust and the King George VI Foundation which gave financial assistance towards the provision of new centres in Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland run by the

Central Council of Physical Recreation (31). Some private firms like Cadbury's and Rowntree's continued to provide a home for sport where ironically the stated objective was that it should 'flourish without becoming commercialised' (32). Games and athletic skills were seen as an antidote to the effects of the repetitive processes and sedentary occupations of industrial life - a paternalism of a socially conscious liberal quaker tradition which went back to the 19th century.

However, a break occurred in the 1960s when the wealthy patrons of sport became less prominent, with corporate companies and agencies gradually establishing an involvement in sponsorship and business management. Altruistic activity carried out with no expectation of economic return - the essence of patronage - was replaced by financial support in the hope of commercial benefit. The defining characteristic of sponsorship is that it is a form of business transaction. It is difficult to pinpoint a specific moment when this occurred, but the general shift in development can be attributed to the early 1960s. The 1956 Birmingham University Report, 'Britain in the World of Sport', which was concerned primarily to make a case for improved funding of sport hardly mentioned the phenomenon - though it is clear that events were supported by some large firms before the Second World War, and since the war the amount of sponsorship both increased and became more varied in form (33). It is estimated by Waite (1977) that over one quarter of the 106 respondents of his study of 'Sponsorship in the U.K.' had begun sponsoring by 1965 (34). The period from 1960 to 1965 thus appears to have been a significant phase in this development. As G. McPartlin, Technical Director of the Central Council of Physical Recreation, pointed out in 1966,

Commercial sponsorship of sport has grown dramatically in recent years. Exact figures are not available, but apart from horse racing and motorised sport there must be at least 100 major annual sporting events dependent entirely or in part on commercial sponsorship (35).

Attempts at providing any kind of history of sports sponsorship either focus largely on the gladiatorial displays of ancient Rome, or make brief and

unexamined references to the pre-World War II interest of the producers of Ovaltine and Elliman's Embrocation, who featured popular sportsmen in their advertising campaigns; or the immediate post-war marketing imagery of Brylcreem which displayed the face of England cricketer Denis Compton in their advertising (36). There is little evidence of sociological analysis which seeks to relate the changes in business activity in sport with wider economic changes or to appreciate the significance of the intensification of commercial values in sporting business transactions and the transformation of the sporting scene (37).

The commercialisation of sport through sponsorship and business management in effect crept up on the sports establishment almost without it fully realising the nature and extent of the influences, or appreciating the significance of the encroachment. There appears not to have been a clearly identifiable conflict between sports bodies and business, but rather the slow filtering through sports events of a business involvement mainly through the practice of sponsorship. There were several reasons for this. Although there was interest from sports administrators in the financial advancement of sport in the 1950s, the main preoccupation was to strengthen the mechanisms for gaining increased funding through the state. There also appeared to be an assumption within the sports establishment that influence in sport was shared between the various interests of professional and voluntary bodies (sports clubs, governing bodies, the Central Council of Physical Recreation), state departments (particularly the Department of Education and Science), private firms and individuals, with no one group dominating or dictating decisions. According to Appendix II of its Report individuals constituting the Wolfenden Committee were chosen for their qualities of detachment and responsibility; it was also stated that in gathering data opinion was sought across a wide spectrum of sporting interests (38). This does not mean, of course, that particular factions were not present in the sports establishment during the late fifties - as was argued in Chapter Three - but the general understanding of influence and control was a pluralistic one, albeit with a largely liberal,

voluntary and amateur set of dominant values. However, as McPartlin indicated in 1966, an increasing variety of commercial organisations had begun to engage in sports sponsorship which ranged from financial support of an individual event to an almost overall backing for a sport in its entirety - new sports like ten-pin bowling and trampolining owing their very existence to the interest of commercial organisations. McPartlin also gave the prescient warning that no matter what the source of support (government or commerce) the governing bodies of sport would do well to ensure that the sponsorship camel did not push the governing body out of the control tent (39).

The sponsorship of sports events, teams and individuals is essentially an area of business advertising, promotion and marketing and the reasons for the growth of sport sponsorship have to be sought in the changes taking place in the business sector as much as in sport itself. Yet both the interest associations of sport and business together with the state have been involved in this development in a complex way. It is not simply a question of sport being corrupted by the external influence of commercialism or the gaining power of the state. Sport does not stand outside society. It is an already socially-constructed activity rather than a *neutral phenomenon*. *It is the way* in which the three elements of state, business and sport interact which is of prime importance in understanding the nature of the relationship between sport and the state.

It is clear that the state played a crucial part in the growth of business interest in sport and that the Labour Government's restriction on television advertising by tobacco companies in August, 1965 was a key factor and landmark in the development of sports sponsorship as a marketing tool. As the Business Observer of 6th September, 1970 put it

the best thing any government ever did for sport was to ban cigarette advertising from television. Barred from the box the tobacco companies have moved into the sports arena in a big way (40).

There is no doubt that this event was significant in sport becoming a major vehicle of big company promotional activity, even if that was not the intended objective of government. Since that date, tobacco companies (Player, Benson and Hedges, Piccadilly, Rothman, Wills, Gallaher, Marlboro and Embassy) have become the biggest sponsors in Britain. Not only did they see this as attractive because it was an alternative to press, poster and cinema advertising, but it was a roundabout way of getting their brands seen and mentioned on television (41). Furthermore, the interest of tobacco companies with sport in particular was related to the 'corporate image' they attempted to promote. As Sally White pointed out,

...constantly being linked with possible dangers to health it is obviously desirable to build an association in the public mind with healthy outdoor sports (42).

Even more critical is that the involvement of the tobacco industry in sports sponsorship has highlighted the power of big business in relation to other interest groups, as well as revealing the contradictory position taken by the state and sport in regard to the issue of health versus financial opportunism. Peter Taylor's investigations into the relationship between governments and the tobacco industry, detailed in Smoke Ring (1984), provided certain evidence of the influence of powerful political and economic interests, which, he argued, since the 1960s have made governments reluctant to take effective action against the half-dozen companies which control the industry. It appears that in the task of maintaining its wealth and power the tobacco industry has employed economic arguments, engaged in direct political action and taken pains to convey an image of provider of public benefits. As Taylor pointed out,

The industry's most potent political defence is that the country (which means the governments who run it) simply cannot afford to be without tobacco ... political allies in the House of Commons ... number around a hundred M.P.s and include the companies paid parliamentary consultants, those with trade union connections, those whose constituents depend on jobs provided by Imperial's many subsidiaries, those who have interests in marketing and consultancy, like former

Labour Minister for Sport, Denis Howell, and those who have strong ideological reasons on the grounds that the state should not nanny the individual (43).

A range of interests were, it appears, brought together to help maintain the power of tobacco companies. Taylor argued that it was both a moral and political issue, and that by presenting itself as a creator of wealth, a source of revenue, the supplier of jobs, the bringer of development, the provider of pleasure, the patron of sport and the arts, and the defender of freedom, the tobacco industry had successfully diverted political attention from the real issue: that the product from which these benefits flow has wiped out more people than all the wars of the 20th century (44). The growth of sponsorship in sport and the arts by tobacco companies seems actually to have strengthened the industry's defences against attack by health authorities like the Royal College of Physicians, ASH, the World Health Organisation and individual Ministers of Health, because it allowed the companies - and indeed spokespersons for sport - to argue that to ban advertising and promotion would cripple the country's sporting and cultural life. Furthermore, sponsorship as a means of advertising, promotion and communication with the public also became more important for tobacco firms as the non-smokers rights movement appealed directly to the people over the heads of politicians. As Taylor pointed out, the industry appeared to know how to handle political representatives, but the loyalty of the consumer was a vital and vulnerable link especially with the increasing threats to the social acceptability of smoking which became even more evident in the 1980s (45).

It was no accident, therefore, that tobacco firms led the way in the sponsorship of sport, both in the amount of financial investment, and in the range of events and activities covered. And they were accordingly influential in establishing standards in the practices of sponsorship which have had implications for the way in which sport has been shaped in its organisation and how it has been perceived by the public. Large companies like Imperial Tobacco Limited have been particularly prominent. The first detailed study on sponsorship produced by Acumen Marketing Group indicated that tobacco firms

easily exceeded their nearest rivals - oil companies - in the table of leading sponsors. Of the big spenders, Player, Rothman, Wills and Gallaher led the way - all tobacco firms, with Player and Wills part of the Imperial Group (46). It has been the companies like Imperial with strong political and ideological motives for making an impact on the public awareness of their products which have invested most in cost/benefit evaluation of sponsorship, and setting criteria for engagement in it.

According to Waite (1977) only a minority of sponsors used any evaluation procedures to measure costs and benefits, and those who chose not to evaluate did so either because they felt the effects of sponsorship were impossible to assess, or because it would not be a cost-effective exercise (47). However, the stakes were clearly high for the larger companies, and tobacco firms in particular. As David Way, Special Events Manager of John Player Ltd, indicated in 1980, a worthwhile sports sponsorship programme for a U.K. manufacturing company which aimed to achieve a degree of spontaneous awareness among the general public took a considerable investment over several years. At 1980 prices this was estimated to cost around £200,000. He stated that his firm was ahead in the public awareness assessment stakes with Wills third (48). Imperial have also set a pattern on the kinds of sports thought worthy of sponsorship. John Player, who went into sponsorship in 1962 has concentrated on professional sport and top-level events in show jumping (the Royal International Event), motor racing, cricket, rugby league, rugby union, and badminton. Their stated criteria for entering sponsorship arrangements are indicative of the processes operating on sport. These are:

- (i) Potential to reach a wide audience.
- (ii) Potential to reach a specified audience.
- (iii) Solus position for the sponsor, (i.e. the only sponsor involved in the event).
- (iv) Generally favoured by the public.

- (v) Large spectator or participant involvement.
- (vi) Mass Media opportunities.
- (vii) Well organised.
- (viii) Style and quality should match desired image (John Players went into motor racing to modernise their image).
- (ix) Pioneering aspect (49).

They are thus very selective in what they sponsor, major determinants being the gaining of media exposure - especially television coverage and large spectator and audience following. The consequence here, as with sponsorship by other major industries and large firms, is for most of the money to flow to the apex of the sports involved - either to the top professional clubs, to the international and national level events, or increasingly to the top individuals and super-stars. The media reinforces this elitism and hierarchy of sports clubs and players, being highly selective in the sports and events which they present and in the manner in which they are presented. The most commonly televised sports in recent years have been horse racing, cricket, football, tennis, snooker and golf. As Atkinson points out, the outcome of this selectivity has been that certain highly popular sports (like angling, squash and table tennis) do not receive any sustained coverage. It has also led to a bias towards male-dominated sports and the ignoring of local teams and events (50). Indeed, the link between the sponsorship of top firms and media selectivity tends to reinforce the dominance of elite forms of sport, to foster sexist values and to promote certain unhealthy products like tobacco.

This pattern has indeed been aided and abetted by the state through the government-supported Sports Council. The Sports Council Working Party on 'Sponsorship' (1971) showed an awareness and sensitivity to the principle of sports bodies accepting sponsorship from cigarette companies and recommended that the Government should

give positive guidance about a code of practice when cigarette companies sponsor sport, before the involvement

in sponsorship increases still further (51).

However, whilst a new code of conduct was drawn up, regulating what was already well regulated, tobacco companies continued to be very much involved in sports sponsorship. Other efforts to control it in the mid-1970s appeared to be made by the Secretary of State for Health, Mr. David Ennals, who described tobacco sponsorship as grotesque, whilst the Action for Smoking and Health (A.S.H.) movement declared its objective of phasing out tobacco sponsorship over five years or so (52).

Yet the dominant position of the Government and senior administrators in sport remained one of being more concerned about financial benefit than about the health issue - at least until 1985 with Minister of Sport, Richard Tracey's and Sports Council's stand on the matter. In particular, the Minister for Sport, Dennis Howell (1964-70 and 1974-79), was not opposed to tobacco's patronage of sport, taking the view that the Chancellor of the Exchequer had long extracted a huge amount in tax from tobacco and that sport was fully entitled to some benefit (53). This view was endorsed by the Committee chaired by Howell in 1983 on the subject of 'Sports Sponsorship' and indeed by the Conservative Minister for Sport, Neil Macfarlane (1982-85). In the Howell Report, (54) the principles of legality and freedom of choice were held to be paramount in considering the involvement in sports sponsorship by the alcohol and tobacco industries and gambling organisations. It was argued that as long as government derived income from these sources through tax revenue, whose source was not differentiated, it would be impossible to prevent sport from benefiting from revenues derived from alcohol, gambling and tobacco (55). But, in addition, the Report argued that the decision to accept sports sponsorship from whatever source must be the prerogative of the governing body of sport concerned and concluded that:

Where a pursuit is lawful and especially when the government itself derives substantial income from such pursuits, there can be no objection in principle to the sponsorship of sport from any sources. The freedom of sport and sports

people to determine these questions for themselves must be safeguarded (56).

The form of interest-group politics represented by this issue is one of competitive individualism of a pluralist kind which upholds the 'liberty' of sports bodies to decide their line of action. But the consequence of this is to give the opportunity for the largest, strongest and most-motivated firms - such as those of the tobacco industry - to dominate the direction and pattern of sponsorship. The key question in the in-house market research evaluation of sponsorship of firms like John Player, is to verify whether the public is aware of and approving of its activities. If awareness and approval are confirmed, then the company is able to assume that this will in some way contribute to company success (57). The Howell Report also focused on public attitudes to sponsorship, and considered surveys about sponsorship by manufacturers of tobacco and other controversial products. The Report concluded that there was little public support for any prohibition by government of sports sponsorship which would deprive sport of income from any legitimate source. It was reported that in a survey of 2,210 adults conducted by Omnimas in 1982 whilst tobacco products stood highest on the list of commodities favoured for control or a ban, only 24% thought that the Government should ban tobacco companies completely from sponsoring events. A survey using a sample of 1,972 adults on behalf of the Tobacco Advisory Council by NOP Market Research Ltd in 1981 indicated 34% were in favour of a ban on sponsorship by cigarette manufacturers (58). On this evidence the Howell Committee were able to reinforce their arguments about freedom, jobs, wealth and the interests of sport. But by this stand they were also choosing to ignore the evidence of medical authorities and thereby giving encouragement to a habit which, the British Royal College of Physicians indicated in its report 'Health or Smoking' (1983), led to the premature death of some 100,000 British citizens every year (59).

The desire of the tobacco companies for alternative advertising has clearly had a significant impact on sports sponsorship, but the influence of

multi-national companies is also marked through the promotion of products which are relatively innocuous in terms of health. Although the contradiction contained in the promotion of unhealthy products through sport for the purpose of financial gain in conjunction with a compliant state needs to be underlined, it is also important to examine how sport is penetrated by other kinds of business. Coca-Cola - a subsidiary of Grand Metropolitan Beechams - is an example of a firm which produces a relatively harmless product in terms of health, but which extends its marketing influence through the basic philosophy of becoming involved with local communities by means of sports sponsorship. The Company's strategy is to establish a natural association between refreshment and physical activity rather than appearing to adopt a hard sell operation. In 1977 the Company reported that £150,000 a year was spent on a sports/leisure/education sponsorship programme - from an approximate budget of £3 million allocated to advertising (60). Although this is a fairly modest proportion, it is not so much the amount allocated to sport which is significant in this case, as the mode of approach. Firstly, it is concerned to be closely involved with sporting events themselves rather than to make donations and allow the sports body to determine its own policy. It sees the relationship between Coca-Cola and sport as a partnership and has on occasion been involved in producing the programmes for various events. They had, for example, close association with David Wilkie, the Olympic Swimmer, through their Dolphin Trophy Learn to Swim Scheme. Secondly, Coca-Cola has operated at different levels of sport from top competition (in athletics and tennis) to schools coaching schemes (in swimming, tennis and sailing) and the Duke of Edinburgh's Award Scheme. It is involved over a wide spectrum of recreational activities and sees its market in leisure and educational events as much as competitive sport. It purports to be much more interested in the notion of individual advancement than in team or national success - hence the concentration on the 'Learn to Swim' Award, and Adventure Training courses for young people between 12 and 20. It is significant in this respect that in November, 1982 the Company withdrew from its sponsorship of competitive swimming in Britain but continued to support the Dolphin Learn

to Swim Award (61). Part of the marketing of these youth ventures has entailed quiz competitions and inter-school trophies, the aim being to focus on the younger age client - the main consumers of their soft drink products (62). Thirdly, Coca Cola is at pains to emphasise its observance of protocol in its dealings with sports bodies, only stepping in when all factors have been looked at by the relevant sports authorities. In the case of the Dolphin Award, the English Schools Swimming Association has handled links with schools, and with the 'New Tennis Scheme for Schools' local authority Physical Education Organisers have been involved. Coca-Cola state that its place is in publicity and financial support - as provider rather than educationist. Nevertheless, it admits to having close contact with a number of schools and to consultations with teachers in the updating of schemes. Fourthly, the Company is concerned with small gains and a low profile in its approach; it is not looking for specifically short-term results but over a period of time is working to create a corporate identity and by exerting influence over the habits and consciousness of the young, attempting to expand the Company's future prosperity.

However, the differences in marketing strategy between John Player and Coca-Cola should not mask the similarity of their aims - of reaching a wide audience in order to further the image of their companies, with the ultimate end of increasing sales of their products. And whatever the approach - national media coverage or education and youth - it is the large firms that dominate. John Player can afford the larger sums to attract major sports and national events, and to assess systematically the value of their investment; and Coca-Cola are able to sustain a long standing involvement required to influence the young over an extended period.

Sponsorship has also contributed to the diversification of what now counts as sport. Some sports (e.g. tennis, golf or snooker) have become very much a part of the entertainment industry with an enormous concentration on the event as a spectacle and on the super-star phenomenon. Others receive a relatively low level of public exposure (e.g. archery,

hockey and netball), and seem to be mainly school or club based. One expression of this development has been the exploitation of certain higher status sporting events as ideal settings for the exercise of client hospitality and the extension of business operations - a practice which has been made more attractive as some sports since the 1960s have gained increased public interest on a national and international scale through business and media interest. Next to gaining media coverage the most important reason for engaging in sponsorship has been the opportunity to entertain (Waite, 1977). As Waite explains, events such as golf or tennis tournaments or race meetings provide opportunities for negotiating and securing business deals over a period of time in situations not possible in say the confined environment of a theatre (63). And as Dakin points out

... sponsorship of an event provides an ideal opportunity for companies to invite their customers along and to give the V.I.P. treatment - a box at Ascot, the best seats at Lords, a grandstand seat at a British Grand Prix (64).

The connection between business involvement at prestigious sporting occasions and the wider political interests of companies is identified by Taylor (1984), who points out that the tobacco industry has used arts and sporting events to cultivate senior civil servants in desirable surroundings. He states

While Imperial entertains at the Glyndebourne Opera, British American Tobacco invites its contacts to the Wimbledon Tennis Championships. Between 1978 and 1981, BAT's guest list at Wimbledon included thirty-six civil servants from government departments which included Customs and Excise, the Treasury, the Department of Industry and the Cabinet Office (65).

A further dimension of the reconstruction of sport through business since the 1960s is the emergence of the star-system which has become the pinnacle of all the interlocking economies - company sponsorship, media

payment and profit for sports coverage and the growth and influence of sports agencies. There have long been national sporting heroes, but sponsorship has given top performers a new significance, which both serves to separate further elite from mass sport, and at the same time provides a model of success defined by a commercial image and which tends to bind the public to capitalist forms of thinking and existence. As Inglis (1977) argued

The star system is the point at which the sporting and entertainment worlds intersect. The stars make fortunes inasmuch as other people make fortunes out of them. And stars have become the success heroes of their time. The sporting stars sit easily beside the film and pop stars. They are all young and they are all classless. Once upon a time, old footballers just faded away ... The stars are like a combination of travelling gunslinger and the people's hero. The vast payments instil not envy or resentment, but hope. The stars look down, and many others look up and say, this man, this woman, is ours (66).

Indeed, sponsorship operates ideologically under liberal and conservative influences embedded in the business world to underline values of competition and nationalism. This is evident in attitudes held both by sponsors and sports administrators. According to Way, the major sponsors of British sport are actually sensitive and critical of much expansion in the sponsorship sphere, though for defensive and protective reasons. The Imperial Company indicates that there is likely to be an ever increasing involvement in sponsorship by overseas companies which will inevitably have an adverse effect on existing major sponsors. The fear is that the price paid by sponsors for events will increase and that it will become increasingly difficult for them to attain a reasonable level of awareness from the public (67). The international market trend in sporting events is demonstrated by Way's revelation that a Japanese whisky company sponsored the Match Play Golf Championships at Wentworth in 1979, notwithstanding the fact that the company did not even market its product in the U.K. The explanation given is that the sponsors sought their rewards in worldwide

coverage on television, and invested about £400,000 in golf for the privilege (68). The Howell Report confirms the trend of Japanese interest, stating that major sponsorships by Japanese companies in 1983 included five Division 1 Football Clubs, three important tennis championships, and snooker, golf, motor-cycling and athletics events. It also points out that the sponsorship of the Football League in 1983 was by the U.K. arm of the Japanese firm Canon (69). Some leading spokespersons for British sport have welcomed this. For instance, the Howell Report commented that 'It may not be in the interest of British manufacturers, but the world is competitive and sport can only benefit' (70). Once again a competitive individualistic ideology, and an allegiance to the subordination of producers to the market is displayed. British companies are, by inference, chided for lagging behind those of other countries in recognising the full value of sport. The Japanese approach is put forward as a model with 'tentacles reaching out world-wide making positive use of the tool of sponsorship as a central feature of its marketing strategy' (71).

However, although the Howell Committee was concerned to encourage British business to extend the scope for the exploitation of sport as a marketing tool, sponsorship in the U.K. had by the 1980s already shown a propensity towards the marketing of sport and associated commodities. One of the key strategies adopted was through the identification of class-based markets. Just as advertisers aim their product promotion at particular class-based segments of the market, so to some extent is this true of sponsors of sport. As Clarke and Critcher point out

Both in the activities sponsored and in the audiences involved with them (particularly through televised sport) sponsorship has a 'mass' or 'popular' target rather than the elite associations of high culture ... There is a tendency for sponsorship to follow televisual values about sport (identifying the dramatic and spectacular events which make 'good television') because it is here that mass audiences will be found (72).

Tobacco companies especially have capitalised on the mass following of

sport. Embassy, in particular, has played a role in targeting on the popular and folk activities of snooker, darts and bowls giving them a 'modern-style projection' and thereby 'creating enormous public interest' from different age groups and a massive return for the money invested. The Howell Report records that during the 1983 Embassy World Professional Snooker Championship, which continued for 17 days, scheduled T.V. viewing reached almost 100 hours (73). Indeed, in only three years from 1980-1983, snooker became the fourth most televised sport in Britain, and in terms of sponsored sports it had the second highest T.V. exposure, only exceeded by cricket. In 1982, darts achieved seventh place and bowls ninth place in the table of sponsored sports on television produced by Sportscan (74). However, as Clarke and Critcher also argue companies do not just recognise a single homogeneous mass market, but a range of markets and a diversity of groups of consumers (75). Indeed, sponsorship of cricket, golf, horse racing, tennis and equestrianism which feature in the top six of sponsored sports on television would appeal to and be directed at different class and gender markets. Stella Artois and BMW sponsor tennis events, Hennessey Cognac, Martini and Sun Alliance invest in golf and Prudential and Nat West have identified cricket, all of which would attract a more middle class following (76). But the general significance of this trend is to underline the increasing structuring of sport by systematic evaluation and calculated targeting of commercial companies. This interpretation contrasts with Inglis' view in that although he draws attention to the presence and influence of the multi-nationals in many sports events, he attributes the motives of sponsors to become involved in sport as arising from the private passion of senior directors for sport. Inglis states

Sponsorship, for all the official dressing-up in terms of increased good will and popularity, television exposure and prominence of brand names, looks more like the result of that deep affection for sport as valuable in itself which remains its central cultural significance (77).

However, Inglis was writing in 1977 and it is evident that the trend since then has been towards the greater visibility of the power and control of

business in sport which as Clarke and Critcher argue threaten to undermine the view of sport as involving distinctively different values from everyday economic and political life (78).

Another significant impact of sponsorship is that some sports have been radically transformed in the way that they are financed, organised, presented and experienced. Cricket is a particular case in point. As the Howell Report on Sponsorship (1983) indicated, cricket relies substantially on sponsorship which has, through the adaptation to suit television, changed the emphasis from three or five-day matches to a one-day game, 'many believe at the expense of the natural skills and traditions of the sport'. In 1982 first-class cricket received £1,380,000 from a range of companies including John Player, Benson and Hedges, Cornhill Insurance, National Westminster Bank, Prudential Assurance and Schweppes (79). The Compton Report on Sponsorship (1981) which aimed to assess the importance of sponsorship to the finances of association football and cricket commented favourably on the developments brought about. With regard to cricket it was stated that

These limited-over matches combined with television, brought new life to a game, which if not dying, was at least stagnating. Sponsorship also allowed the top players to be well paid, thus encouraging the young to see first-class cricket as a desirable profession, able to provide a good financial return as well as enjoyment (80).

However, although the Howell Committee seemed to regard changes in cricket as inevitable and to generally applaud the growth of sponsorship for the sport, a number of concerns were expressed which indicated the negative effects of sponsorship. At the level of county club cricket the need for success on the field in order to attract sponsors was said to have led players to become more conscious of the commercial rewards and to adopt a more defensive and cautious approach. At international level the enticement of players to defy their governing bodies and to participate in South Africa was considered by the Howell Committee to be a disturbing development which could have serious repercussions for the sport as a whole (81). Sports

representatives thus appeared to be wanting the financial benefits of sponsorship but were concerned about the effects on the nature of individual sports and the loss of control which the process of commercialism brought with it. Sebastian Coe in 1981 identified a change in attitude in what was expected by the public from sport and athletes as largely a response to expectations generated by the media. This was conveyed as a shift from 'support for a team' to a desire for 'style', 'entertainment' and a 'clamour for world records' (82). Although Coe himself claimed to be interested in athletics for the enjoyment of competition and achievement he also benefited financially from these changes which attracted the attention of professional advertising agents and managers. Such developments were indicative of the transformation of business interests from patronage of sport to more acquisitive forms of commercial involvement.

Commercial Values and Liberal Positions

Trends towards the increasing commercial interest in certain sports since the 1960s have been outlined in the foregoing pages in discussion of the shift from patronage to sponsorship, and some of the key factors and effects have been identified. This section aims to examine further the significance of business connections with sport particularly in relation to sponsorship in the 1970s and 1980s. Consideration will be given firstly, to the broad political parameters underlying the growth in business involvement in sport, and secondly, to the conflicting values and contradictions evident in positions taken in debate on the questions surrounding the protection of sport from the control of commercial companies and agencies.

Although sponsorship developed during the 1970s and 1980s as a form of company promotion, and became an important factor in corporate communications and advertising, the marked expansion of the financial value of sponsorship of sport - from £2.5 million (Sports Council estimate, 1971) to £40 million (Compton Report estimate, 1981) then £150 million (Sports

Council estimate, 1987) - did not take place in a political vacuum. Indeed, the political and ideological context of the period was a significant influence both in the growth of sponsorship and in the broader development of relationships between business and culture. Sponsorship flourished and became a generally accepted phenomenon in society not only because companies recognised the potential markets that could be reached through media exposure, or the scope for entertaining important clients at prestigious events, or because it was a means of financing sport and the arts. It was also an expression of the political Right's strategy of identifying popular interests and aspirations and linking these with the market and the restoration of the capitalist ethic. From the mid-1970s the apparent problem for governments of financing increasing social and cultural demands from public expenditure led to an exploration of ways of tapping business sources. In 1975, the Labour Government in the context of public sector cut-backs indicated that it was considering the possibilities of bursaries financed by commercial sponsors for outstanding athletes to enable them to prepare for top competition (83). This signalled a move towards government interest in closer links between sport and business. However, the Thatcher Conservative Government, on taking office in 1979, extended the shift to the Right with a more explicit business orientation. In regard to sport this ideological and political intervention was made clear in January 1980 by the Minister for Sport, Hector Monro, in his statement to the House of Commons Debate on Leisure, Sport and the Arts. He announced then that

The Government had found it necessary to limit public investment in sport and the Arts. Economic growth comes first and support will depend on this ... Government would give every support and encouragement to commercial investment and sponsorship in sport and recreation (84).

Similarly, the Minister for the Arts, Norman St. John Stevas, 1979-81 was concerned with encouraging co-operation between business and the arts, and was instrumental in initiating a campaign in 1980 to persuade industry and business to invest in the arts (85). In both sport and the arts, Conservative ministers opportunistically turned the problem of finding

sufficient financial support for the provision of cultural activities to the political advantage of a radical Government intent on disciplining public sector institutions, reducing demands on the state and creating in the public mind the notions that the private sector offered efficiency and 'value-for-money'.

The pursuit of sponsorship by sports organisations which had already taken on a significant function for a number of governing bodies of sport was thus given further encouragement by successive ministers for sport in the 1980s. Both the Sports Council and Central Council of Physical Recreation extended their services in bringing together sports bodies and prospective sponsors and generally fostered connections between sport and business. During 1981-82, the Sports Council commissioned a report on 'Sport and Taxation' which formed the basis of a seminar bringing together representatives of selected firms to discuss co-operation between the private and public sectors (86). They also set up a Sports Sponsorship Advisory Service in co-operation with the Central Council of Physical Recreation. The shift to 'a more businesslike approach to administration' by the Sports Council in the mid-1980s with 'a ten-year corporate plan', 'a harder line on grant-aid' and 'a tougher attitude to drug abuse in sport' was also applauded by Minister for Sport (1982-85), Neil Macfarlane (87). The themes of Thatcherism - of linking efficiency with competition and market forces, of ruthlessly disciplining demands by consumers on the state, and of extolling the virtues of the private sector - were in effect strengthened through the policies adopted in sport. This was particularly evident with programmes of the government agency of the Sports Council broadly influenced by successive Ministers for Sport. Business interest and the practice of sponsorship was already prevalent by the late 1970s, but it was both given a greater impetus and incorporated into the ideological strategies of Thatcherism in the 1980s. Mrs. Thatcher, herself, in 1983 declared, 'there's a great industry in other people's pleasure', thereby highlighting the significance of leisure as a business (88). By 1987, the

Sports Council had clearly internalised this message and underlined its acknowledgement of the importance of the private sector for the development of its own programme, in the statement,

The Sports Council itself had a solid year of achievement, and takes pride in the fact that, at a time of restraint in public expenditure, it was able to make considerable progress towards the objectives set out in its first Corporate Plan - and also to demonstrate this through improved monitoring and assessment of performance ... A key factor in this success was the Council's commitment to building a strong partnership with the private sector ... such partnerships with the commercial sector will continue to be essential (89).

However, there were also tensions between business and sport. It was not a simple matter of co-operation between the two for their mutual benefit, or an unchallenged takeover of sport by big business. Business values are not just reproduced in sport in a mechanistic fashion. The liberal wing of the sports establishment sought to remind sports bodies of the dangers of business encroachment as well as the advantages. The Howell Enquiry on Sponsorship signified a liberal position in upholding the freedom and responsibility of sports organisations, and in attacking the apparent control that certain companies seemed to be acquiring in the running of sports events. But it was also a liberalism which far from challenging the competitive and market values of commercialism actually reinforced them.

The Howell Committee specifically identified 'sports agencies' as the focus of their concerns. As the Howell Report explained, sports agencies were a post-war phenomenon whose number had grown quickly in pace with the ever-increasing sponsorship demands of sport. They acted as brokers, shopping around for the most suitable and rewarding sources of finance. Many provided the organisation to promote or stage events with, or on behalf of, sport. They also often undertook all the public relations and media aspects of events and advertising arrangements (90). Three of these agencies which operated on an international scale were singled out by the Howell Committee for critical examination: Adidas, West Nally and

International Management Group.

Adidas admitted to providing their equipment to Rugby Union players for commercial reasons, to compete with other manufacturers who were making payments to individual players on an ad-hoc basis (91). There was also an apparent involvement of the company in the election of officers of international sports organisations. Adidas acknowledged that they maintained records of people of importance throughout the world of sport, and that these were made available to those who asked for them. Although there is no conclusive evidence that such information was used in connection with the election of officers of international federations like the International Olympic Committee (I.O.C.), there was an inference within the Howell Enquiry that this was the case. It was also pointed out that Adidas had undertaken in co-operation with the Federation Internationale de Football Associations (F.I.F.A.) an extensive programme of activity for the development of soccer in Africa, and had introduced a package scheme involving multi-national companies in a new company, S.M.P.I. based in Monte Carlo to maximise revenue for World Cup and other major football occasions. The suspicions about the role of Adidas in these deals prompted the Howell Enquiry to recommend that it would be appropriate for the General Association of International Sports Federations and the International Assembly of National Organisations of Sport to consider the financial involvement of Adidas and its associates in respect of F.I.F.A., the I.O.C. and other international sports federations in order to ensure that such involvement was compatible with the interests of international sport.

The West Nally Group were also selected for scrutiny, particular concern being expressed by the Howell Enquiry into its relationships with the General Association of International Sports Federations (G.A.I.S.F.) (92). The Howell Report indicated that West Nally had come to an agreement in 1977 to meet the administrative costs of G.A.I.S.F. through revenue from sponsorship - the financial arrangement being that West Nally took a

percentage of all receipts subject to G.A.I.S.F. having an agreed minimum sum of money. The interlocking interests raised doubts in the minds of the Howell Committee, which again called for the disclosure of details of these financial arrangements.

International Management Group (I.M.G.) rated as the most prominent of the international sports agencies, caused Howell and his colleagues the most concern (93). Their evidence indicated that I.M.G., directed by Mark McCormack, had reached a level of involvement where they were able to represent a governing body, sponsors, a significant number of top players, and at the same time negotiate television, cable and satellite contracts and sell merchandising rights. In this instance, the Howell Committee recommended that the Government should refer to the Office of Fair Trading for full examination of the relationship between the International Management Group and important sporting events in the United Kingdom to establish whether any monopoly existed.

There is, however, an ambivalence in the position taken by the Howell Enquiry: it can be seen manifestly as an attempt to grapple with the growing power of commerce in sport, but on closer examination a number of contradictions became evident. Firstly, it is clear that the Committee applauded, welcomed, and was concerned to promote the growth of sponsorship; but on the other hand it recognised the tendencies towards a loss of control by governing bodies of sport and was attempting to bring about legal measures to make the sports agencies and multi-nationals accountable to public authorities. The Howell Committee expressed its concern that at international level some of those who organised sports sponsorship contracts did not seem to recognise that their accountability was to sport itself, and that profit-seeking agencies on some occasions represented not only sport, but also the commercial companies taking advantage of sporting occasions (94). At the same time it was at pains to avoid saying that commercial sponsorship was inherently bad, declaring that, 'with the constant chase for

better and higher standards these developments seem inevitable' (95).

Secondly, some duplicity was shown over international sport, particularly in regard to the Olympic Games. The gap between the rhetoric of Olympism and the commercial attitudes to the Games in practice was clearly apparent to the Committee and it expressed its unease about this. Yet it showed an acceptance of the trends. As it said, it was aware of the view that the motto of the International Olympic Committee, 'Faster, Higher, Stronger' (Citius, Altius, Fortius) was rapidly coming to mean 'Bigger, Dearer, More Grandiose'. It also condemned many aspects of commercialism. But the ultimate concern was more with integrity and proper consultation in the process of commercial dealings with sport. As long as sports bodies were in control of the commercial drift then this seemed to be acceptable to it. There was no sense of reversing or resisting the trend; merely to control its direction by ensuring that sports bodies were in command of the decision making process. Indeed, the commercial development of sport was endorsed by the liberalism of the Howell Committee - given the satisfactory construction and implementation of a code of ethics and the regulation of standards to safeguard the collective interests of sport, governing bodies, promoters, organisers, sponsors and agents against abuse and exploitation. The Committee's overall approach to the subject was summarised in the statement that

the sponsorship of sport provides a service to the whole of sport and to the community which sport serves; in this respect, therefore, it also serves the whole community (96).

Although the excesses of commercial exploitation were condemned and the extension of sponsorship at regional and local level was recommended, no attempt was made to propose a redistribution to special groups such as the positive discrimination towards the deprived made by the Greater London Council's post-1983 policy on sport. Indeed, it is apparent that by more efficient monitoring and exchange, it was intended that sport, business and

the Sports Council would move to a closer relationship - a more developed bargaining process.

There is a third point of contradiction in the Report: support for the agencies was made on the justification that sport and sports people had benefited financially; yet the financial priorities which are of the essence of sponsorship served to undermine the moral ethics which the liberals purported to preserve. The case presented by the Committee on behalf of sports agencies assumed that sport could not exist without sponsorship; that it was an integral part of sports life. The Howell Enquiry concluded in favour of sports agencies for efficiency and high quality service potential (97). Indeed, the sports world was criticised for its ignorance of business matters, and it was considered that it needed help from professionals who knew the business world on how to sell sponsorship. Far from challenging the world of finance and profit, it was implied that sports administrators should integrate with it: in effect, to learn its tricks and become a cog in its marketing schemes; but that this should be conducted with the highest degree of professional practice and ethical standards. The ethics were therefore defined in terms of the declaration and knowledge of agreements between sponsors and sporting bodies, the avoidance of monopoly situations, and the maintenance of registers by international federations and national associations. The 'play element', so much upheld by the Wolfenden Committee in 1960 and in the Sports Council's 'Sport for All' drive in the 1970s, was still evident in the 1980s Sports Council focus on participation with special groups; but also implicit was the intent to 'widen the range of partners with whom it works especially in the commercial sector' (98).

Furthermore, on the one hand, the Howell Committee sided with the critics of commercial sports agents, like I.M.G. citing Sir Denis Follows, then Chairman of the British Olympic Association, in his condemnation of sport at top level having become show-business - with the agent or

entrepreneur cracking the whip assisted by the television producer (99). But it also concluded that the potential benefits - essentially financial - provided by reputable sports agencies, far outweighed the inefficiencies or encroachment upon the prerogatives of sport by less reputable ones (100). The way forward was seen to be a strategy to provide safeguards for sport and sports practitioners whilst at the same time giving support to the prevailing system. In practical terms this was manifest in the recommendation that the C.C.P.R. should establish a 'Register of Sports Agencies' which would require that interests held in any other agency or related activity within sport were registered, together with details of services provided and sponsorship in which they were involved. In addition, it was recommended that the Sports Council should be responsible for establishing and supervising the principles and practice of sports sponsorship.

The overall message that can be drawn from the conclusions and recommendations of the Howell Committee is that a case was being made for state control rather than allowing the free play of market forces in sport. Sponsorship was, by definition, a relationship between business and sport, being seen as 'support of sport, sports event, sports organisation or competitor by an outside body or person for the mutual benefit of both parties' (101). In attempting to control the activities of business firms and agents the Howell Committee was simultaneously signalling its concern about the loss of influence and authority by sport's own governing bodies. It also signified the difference in approach between the traditional 'liberals' exemplified by Denis Follows, who deprecated the commercial influence, and the Howell group who, whilst flying the flag of liberalism/social democracy, attached this firmly to the commercial thrust in sport. Sir Denis Follows, as Chairman of the British Olympic Association, and the Hon. Treasurer of the Central Council of Physical Recreation, represented the older notion of liberalism - a humanist kind of idealism of sport in which amateurism, the 'spirit of the game for its own

sake' and 'fair play' were the defining characteristics. These values were enshrined in the Olympic movement, formed the basis of 'recreative training' in the 1930s and the subsequent development of the C.C.P.R. and coloured the ethos of much of the Wolfenden Committee Report of 1960. But, paradoxically, the emphasis in liberalism of freedom to act and choose also led to an intensification of competition in sport, the demand for increased amenities and higher rewards and with this the involvement of business. The Howell group went along with the enabling of sponsorship. And although it was concerned to maintain freedom for sport and control by the formal sports bodies, actually provided a platform for the expansion of commercialism, because it failed, perhaps to understand but certainly to attack the basis of the capitalist nature of sponsorship in Britain in the 1980s. Indeed, the practice of sports sponsorship in capitalist terms highlights a particular kind of resource allocation, in that it combines both production and consumption functions. The sponsor uses capital as a marketing tool or investment for the increased turnover of goods; at the same time the sports event, organisation or performer receives financial support in ways other than by voluntary or public means. Marketing viewed as a technology for inducing behavioural change, with persuasion the central activity, is an aspect of product management (102). Whilst it is not part of the process of the manufacture of a product, it is closely connected in its presentation. In addition, the role of sports agents is about accumulation of capital as much as the provision of a service for consumers. The sports agency, International Management Group, which according to the Howell Report represented ten important companies in the United Kingdom and forty in the U.S.A., had an interest in the film rights of sporting events, and represented a number of sports federations and associations in negotiating the sale of their world-wide television rights, was clearly involved in capital accumulation as well as providing a service to consumers (103). Sport at top competitive level in its business association, is about production as

well as consumption and the agents and sponsors are fully engaged in this process.

Inglis, on the other hand, critically develops the point of the significance of this association of business with sport, which is directed especially to the top competitive sporting levels, but could equally well apply to the educational sporting sector. He argues that:

Sponsorship may be said to be lethal in so far as it signals the penetration of sporting virtues - the non-productive, essentially human and creative virtues - by manipulative, merely commercial values. The values of acquisition, of publicity, of the cynical deployment of human relations as commodities for profit. Thus far to see the names of the giant corporations at Wembley, Lords, Gleneagles or the Olympic stadium is to be reminded of their vast omnipresence. It is to understand again their profound instinct and drive for domination, so that even the games we play take place beneath those large imperial banners (104).

Inglis maintains that company sponsorship in sport - particularly golf, tennis, football, and cricket signals the more or less deep suffusion of sporting institutions and their economics in the terms of giant capitalist corporations and their morality. But whilst Inglis emphasises the necessity of recognising these features of sport under the influence of commercial forces, he is also at pains to communicate his own love of sport and games and 'the rich promise that sport holds out'. His book, The Name of the Game: Sport and Society, is a celebration of friendship found through sport from his own experiences and observations. He also attempts to make political and metaphysical connections through relating sport to the lives people really lead. Indeed, he contrasts the exhilaration found possible in popular sport with the realities of everyday life

with its mobility and divisions, the deadlines of so much work, the desert places of so much public and social living, the separateness of our giant

social institutions - the great transit
camps of the universities and schools,
the blank meaning of everyday work (105).

Inglis thus conveys the diverse nature of sport and the social benefits to be gained from it, but also points to the oppressiveness of society within which sport takes place. However, sport seems to be seen by him optimistically as a kind of retreat and compensation. There is no clear indication of what a wider socialist conception of sport would entail. Neither is there a sense of a politics of culture which looks to ways of advancing real empowerment for communities through sport. The danger is that the 'real human' side of certain sports may also be eroded as the scope for sponsorship increases and the encroachment of commercialism continues aided and abetted, ironically, by the liberal defenders of sport. Indeed, there is little evidence that the powerful critique of sponsorship by Inglis in 1977 was heeded by the Howell Committee on Sponsorship (1983). There was no reference to Inglis' work in the Report of the Howell Committee, and although Macfarlane cited Inglis' publication, The Name of the Game in the Bibliography of Sport and Politics (1986) there was no discussion of his approach to sponsorship. It would have been possible to have overlooked the contribution of Inglis to an understanding of the significance of sponsorship, for this was to some extent inconspicuous as a chapter of his book, The Name of the Game. However, both Denis Howell and Neil Macfarlane were apparently aware of the publication (106). The Howell Committee did claim to have considered the pronouncements and conclusions of relevant publications on sponsorship undertaken between 1971-82, but these were confined to two Sports Council reports, a C.C.P.R. survey, the report by Nigel Waite (1976) 'Sponsorship in the United Kingdom', the Economist Intelligence Unit 'Special Report on Sponsorship' (1980) the Compton Sponsorship Report on Association Football and Cricket (1981) and the publication by Victor Head (1982) The Newest Marketing Skills (107). And although these documents provided estimates of the scale of sponsorship and raised a range of

issues like media interest, the dangers of sponsorship to the structure of sport, the favouring of star players and events to the detriment of grass roots needs, and the problems of withdrawal or alternatively greater control by sponsors, they were conceived as problems of organisation to overcome rather than as matters to be resolved in the political and ideological process. Indeed, the underlying assumption was to maintain the place of sponsorship in sport with certain safeguards of management and control.

But as Whannel (1983) pointed out, in a capitalist society any popular leisure activity was also going to be highly commercialised and change within sport alone could not have dramatic results. He argued that real change in the nature of sport depends on a broader socialist transformation, but at the same time that development in sports provision should not be ignored. Indeed, he shows that a strategy for change and an understanding of what socialism involves in the 1980s could also be enhanced by a scrutiny of traditional ways and forms of cultural provision (108). Both the Howell Committee, the range of reports on sponsorship since 1971 and indeed the views of Inglis (in relation to his sentimental idolisation of sports) are rooted in the traditional forms and structures of British society. As indicated at the beginning of this section and in earlier chapters the political and ideological interventions of the 1980s have already begun to transform the way in which leisure and sport is structured and perceived - as a commercialised, marketed, and privatised entertainment. Sponsorship has contributed to these changes, but this is because the parameters and structures within which sponsorship has been conceived, organised and practised have been mainly those guided by liberal and neo-liberal conservative values of Western capitalism. Indeed, as Clarke and Critcher argued in 1985 the range and pervasiveness of leisure and its significance for capitalist economic and cultural domination has increased in the 1980s, and the emphasis on marketing strategies which

appeal to known consumer preferences has become the dominant mode of contemporary politics (109). The growth in the sponsorship of sport has been an important part of the marketing and advertising trend. Clarke and Critcher also provide further analysis of the ideological significance of these liberal-capitalist developments. They point out that

The ability of consumer-orientated capitalism to deliver the leisure goods is used as its political validation ... Any alternatives to the market model at home and abroad are dismissed because they threaten to diminish 'consumer choice'. This ideological use of leisure equates the public interest within the pursuit of private gain by both seller and buyer ... Leisure is the perfect model of the free play of market forces, to which other systems - of health, housing and education are being made to approximate ... In such ways has the market become the major institutions and ideology of leisure. Far from being the antithesis of freedom, it has been represented as its realisation. Broader questions of freedom and control have been narrowed around the right to consumer choice (110).

The freedom of governing bodies of sport to choose their own sponsors including tobacco companies, the freedom of multi-national agencies to promote sponsorship and the freedom of consumers to select the marketed and highly sponsored major media-presented sports are aspects of the liberalism which underpins much of sport in Britain and which helps maintain capitalist economic and cultural domination.

The Significance of Sponsorship in Local Settings

Although at this point of the chapter some of the dominant features of sponsorship in sport have already been identified, it is necessary to recognise that its increase since the 1960s has taken a diversity of forms involving local as well as multi-national companies, small and large amounts of money, and varying kinds of relationships between commerce, sports organisations and statutory authorities. Further issues arise from an acknowledgement of the multiformity and

extensiveness of sponsorship. For instance, how far and in which way does sponsorship penetrate to the lives of people? Is there a space where sport and physical recreation can take place away from the banners of multi-national companies and super-star images, and if so, to what extent does this offset the encroachment of commerce through mainstream sponsorship? Where sponsorship occurs at regional and local level how different is this from the sponsorship of national events and professional and spectator sports? What are the patterns and trends in sponsorship in the regions and local authorities, and what political and ideological significance do these contain? This section aims to examine these questions and others with particular focus on the West Midlands area. The line of enquiry addresses firstly the amount, range and typicality of local sponsorship, secondly, the perceptions of and reactions to sponsorship from recreation management and regional bodies, and linked to this, the priorities and objectives contained in decisions about sponsorship and how these relate to other priorities/objectives of local authorities and regional sports committees.

As the Howell Report indicated the aspect of regional and local sponsorship either has been ignored or undervalued in other general studies on the subject (111). The Howell Report itself provided some data based on responses from the Sports Council regional offices, and from two surveys - one based on Stratford-on-Avon, the other undertaken in the West Midlands (112). The author's own research based on the West Midlands involving interviews with local authority officers, local sports council representatives, the Regional Sports Council officers and members, and officials from three major sponsoring firms both supplements and attempts to deepen the level of enquiry. The Howell Report in general provided information, but this was reported in a raw state or interpreted fairly uncritically from a managerialist position. The aim here is to provide a more sociological analysis and critical level of discussion.

It is evident that sponsorship at the regional and local levels is a developing but diverse phenomenon which has grown along with mainstream sponsorship towards business links with cultural activities since the 1970s, and has involved a wide range of companies representing a multiplicity of products (113). The total overall amount of sponsorship at the local level appears to have been not insubstantial - in 1982 this was £13.7m (or 25%-27%) of a national figure of £48.9m - but spread amongst nine Sports Council regions and in the order of more than 1,000 companies covering hundreds of events, then it is less sizable (114). Indeed, regional reports by the Sports Council on a nation-wide basis in 1982 show that local sponsorship has been piecemeal, relatively unco-ordinated and usually of small amounts though fairly easy to obtain (115). These reports also appeared to indicate variations which reflect the inequalities in regions brought about by expanding and declining industries. In London and the South East, sponsorship was estimated to be considerable, whereas in regard to the East Midlands it was stated

Major regional companies like Boots and Plessey show little interest while certain counties such as Northamptonshire and Leicestershire suffer because of the depressed state of 'native' industries like textiles and leather (116).

However, in the context of economic decline, it is noteworthy that grass roots sponsorship in the West Midlands though also of small sums for particular events was thought by the Sports Council's Regional Director to be considerable. During the late 1970s and 1980s the West Midlands experienced the effects of deindustrialisation with a marked increase in unemployment and government pressure on public sector spending. Yet this situation perhaps also provided a purpose for commercial companies to sponsor sport - either because of the increased competition for consumers, or because of a corporate concern to support sports involvement as a means of ameliorating the effects of high unemployment.

These points will be considered further later in this section.

The general trend is clearly towards an expansion of sponsorship. In January, 1984, the Sports Council listed a wide range of 1,165 U.K. companies involved in the sponsorship of sporting activities. By January, 1987 the number recorded had grown to 1,573 - an increase of 35% in three years (117). The lists contained familiar names of multi-national status and fairly obscure provincial ones. But what does this amalgam represent? On the one hand local sponsorship can be seen to be qualitatively as well as quantitatively different from the 'large companies interest in televised sports and focus on mass audiences. Indeed, local authorities as well as commercial companies use the term 'sponsorship' to describe the provision of facilities for sports events or receptions for sports organisers and teams. And companies may adopt a low-key profile for local schemes. As Jim Sadler, West Midlands Sports Council Director, was reported to have stated

... we are aware of a considerable amount of grass roots sponsorship which is equated more readily with patronage or the wish to be seen as a good neighbour rather than as a commercial sponsor (118).

However, these impressions should not be taken at face value, for although small-scale and local sponsorship might convey a less intrusive commercialism than the 'hard-sell' often associated with national and international events, nevertheless it is still linked to the advertising and marketing function of companies. In contrast to Sadler's comments the Regional Sports Council's Director for the North West in 1982-83 presented sponsorship in more commercial terms, indicating that cash was available from sponsors for sport but less readily than before and 'seldom without "strings"', and that 'sponsors should expect and receive a return for their outlay' (119). Gratton and Taylor (1987) also maintain that sponsorship is attractive to companies across the whole of the commercial sector and that forecasts indicate that it is likely to

grow faster than nearly any other form of advertising in the late 1980s (120). Furthermore, sponsorship at whatever level and amount is subject to the construction of ideological meanings and significance. Indeed, as a practice which upholds business values sponsorship has been largely appropriated by the neo-liberalism of the radical Right in the 1980s. For example, the Business Sponsorship Incentive Scheme established for the Arts in 1984 has involved the Conservative government in matching on a pound-for-pound basis any new sponsorship from £1,000 to £25,000 for a company that has never sponsored the arts before (121). And the Sports Sponsorship Advisory Service offered by the Sports Council and Central Council of Physical Recreation provides a means of communication between sponsor and sport. Organisers of sporting events - large and small - set out their requirements for funding and identify the likely market potential for would-be sponsors. The format and language in which this service is presented in the late 1980s signifies an increasing awareness and skill by governing bodies in identifying the capacity of sporting events and activities in advertising and marketing terms. They are adapting to the parameters of a business oriented framework for sport, irrespective of whether they may all have fully internalised the wider values of Thatcherism. However this tendency indicates that Thatcherism has been dominating the ideological ground. The Sports Council/C.C.P.R. Advisory Service produces a document of major and minor events which highlights the scope for 'publicity and visibility' and 'hospitality'. In November 1987 schools and sports centres, local press and radio were cited there as venues for the distribution of promotional materials (in relation to, for example, the English Basketball Proficiency Award Scheme, and a regional Pop Lacrosse competition), whilst the Ramblers Association's advertisement of a 'family rambling day' indicated that it was 'ideal for a sponsor-wanting to be associated with a healthy family image'. The point is that the sponsorship of sport at regional and local levels or involving small amounts of money does not necessarily signify an alternative or oppositional meaning for sports in counter

hegemonic terms to Thatcherism. It can also be an extension of commercial values and a capitalist meaning of the market to a wider public. Indeed, in a society dominated by a neo-liberal political ideology this is the more likely outcome.

The companies which dominate the local/regional market tend to be the key industries of an area, and this is demonstrated in the level and extent of sports sponsorship in the West Midlands. In 1982 the leading sponsors there were brewers, the motor trade, building and construction and the media (122). Don Anthony (1980) saw sponsorship with the commercial encroachment in sport and the invasion by the public relations and marketing men as a threat to sport as education and health. Nevertheless, he also argued that the liaison between sport and the major industries of towns could be valuable for sports clubs in 'broadening their scope' and to industry as a means of 'improving industrial relations' - a relationship of mutual interest. But this was dependent on the conditions in which sponsorship was negotiated. As he stated

For those of us who still believe
in sport as a social service, a school
for the emotions, a wedding of mind and
muscle, a human right - the unfettered
involvement of commerce would be an
insult ... I have no objection to commerce
or to profit - on certain conditions ...
However, I do object to the abject surrender
of sport to market forces. I want sport to
maintain a moral leadership in the world. I
want interested commercial agencies to
observe the ethics of the sporting message
and the principles of sport as health and
education (123).

As indicated in Chapter One Anthony represents a liberal position and defends the 'humanist virtues' of sport against commerce, but given the presence and development of sponsorship he follows the line of attacking the control of multi-national companies whilst recognising the difference perhaps in the local situation and lower levels where it is

thought the commercial threat might be kept within bounds. However, a key question is how far the local/regional level represents a distinctively controlled and limited form of sponsorship in this liberal notion and to what extent radical Right or radical Left meanings are evident.

In 1983/84 I identified three business firms in the West Midlands known for their close connection with local sport to assess the general characteristics of local sponsorship in relation to the issues cited above. These were a Hypermarket store in Sandwell, a Blackcountry brewery and a Wolverhampton-based construction company (124). In each case the companies appeared to present a corporate interest in being seen to be providing a service for the regional/local community through the relatively modest sponsorship sums of approximately £10,000-£15,000 for the year. Goodwill seemed to have been generated with sports bodies at regional and local level, and the activities and interests of these companies were considered by sports organisations to be more of an 'altruistic' than a 'hard-headed' commercial approach. Close and mutually supportive links had been negotiated and established between clubs, local authorities, the local sports councils and the regional Sports Council in which the administration was largely in the hands of sports representatives. The commercial sponsorship in these contexts seemed to be a far cry from the manipulative and acquisitive values of the giant corporations intent on the 'deployment of human relations as commodities for profit' (Inglis, 1977). The Hypermarket in Sandwell, for instance, focused its sponsorship on projects which would benefit underprivileged people, especially the elderly and the handicapped. The brewing company also cited the extent to which activities benefited the community as one of the main criteria in offering sponsorship. The construction firm, though mainly concerned with sponsoring a 'School of Sport' for selected young people at an advanced level, also provided material support locally for indoor sports like badminton, basketball,

gymnastics, judo and table-tennis, which did not feature significantly in the British Media, and therefore did not have the financial advantages of being in the top grouping of sponsored sports (125).

However, the community was also perceived by these companies as consumers as well as participants in sport. The aim of enhancing the cultural and sporting life of the community seems to have been motivated ultimately by the business purposes of the firms and their management. Sports occasions provide an arena for display of company names. Sponsorship investment can achieve a great deal of local and regional publicity, probably outweighing the amount spent on it. The main events sponsored by the Hypermarket in 1983/84 included: a 'Learn to Swim' campaign costing the company approximately £800; the Sandwell Marathon costing approximately £2,500 - and which raised over £60,000 for charities; a boxing event costing approximately £2,000 - which raised £6,000 donated to Mencap for a barge holiday week; and the Sandwell fashion show - clothes being supplied by the company for the modelling of Miss Sandwell - approximately £600. By focusing on events which themselves set out to raise money the publicity was multiplied. That this was also related to doing something for the underprivileged provided an image of the caring and benevolent firm for little expense. The brewery company also extended its sponsorship through a range of events, but notably targeting on class-based popular cultural activities, from pigeon races to agricultural shows, sports festivals, darts leagues, brass bands and local horse racing. The construction company obtained ongoing public exposure through the infrastructure of the local and regional sporting institutions. The language which pervaded the policy and review statements of the company epitomised the approach to its choice of sports sponsorship - of the selection and development of talent and specialist training as distinct from community recreation. The construction firm held expectations of 'personal commitment' from executives and 'loyalty' and 'hard work' from

employees; of the need to provide opportunity for first-time buyers to get their 'feet on the housing ladder' and the natural desire of existing owners 'to improve their personal environment'. Far from there being a general assistance to local sports, to communities in special need, or to women and ethnic minorities, there seems to have been a selectivity based on the desired image the firms wished to promote and/or a concentration on activities and events which would maximise contact with potential consumers.

This selectivity and control was also evident with the kinds of clients identified as deserving of the sponsors support and the conditions which were imposed in the process of negotiating sponsorship terms. The criteria for the award of sponsorship by the Hypermarket management favoured the respectable and unproblematic client. The first condition for the award of sponsorship was that the recipient body should not bring the company's name into disrepute. The firm did not wish to be associated with events which were not seen to be a success and any failures were apparently told firmly that 'support would not be forthcoming in the future'. Representatives of the firm sat on the organising committees for events, thus ensuring close company involvement and scrutiny. Similarly, the brewery company emphasised the need for close liaison to ensure that the good name of the firm was upheld and that financial affairs were properly conducted. They insisted on a committee being formed by clubs sponsored and that two representatives of the brewery were invited to serve on the committee for the initial organisation. Banking arrangements were supervised and the sponsor attended any presentations to check that the money was handed to those for whom it was intended and to ensure that appropriate representatives for charity were present to receive cheques. The construction company aimed for control and efficiency and a secure establishment image through agreed administrative tasks being shared between the sponsor, local authorities and the regional sports council.

As with the decentralised stance contained in this particular company's policy statement, the thrust was outwards, but within controlled guidelines and with systematic monitoring, with the ultimate purpose of growth and development. Whilst it may be understandable that companies would wish to achieve an image of success and confirm that their money is directed as intended, this approach would seem to favour those clients who were already committed club members. The unorganised bands of unemployed youth roaming the commercial centres of the Midlands in search of something to do or small informal sports groups with no kind of official recognition tended to be overlooked (126).

These leading West Midlands sponsoring companies thus moved into the cultural area in the 1980s as a means of promoting their image. They negotiated terms with sports organisations, local authorities and other bodies in ways which benefited certain sports and activities, but which could foster a positive public conception of benevolent and responsible businesses, and in the context of attempts to withstand the effects of industrial change and high unemployment. Sponsorship of community sports and recreation events as well as being a means of marketing, for example, the products of household consumables, alcohol and the civil engineering business also seemed to represent an aspect of business and corporate attempts to boost the spirit of the region. The significance and link between the cultural, political and business domain was highlighted in the award of 'Midlander of the Year' in 1986 to Sir Eric Pountain, Chairman of Tarmac (the construction company) by a panel of radio, T.V. and press journalists. Charles Darby, Chairman of Bass Mitchell and Butler is reported to have said that

Sir Eric had been singled out
because of his outstanding contribution
to the social, political, industrial and
cultural life of the region (127).

It is, therefore, suggested that sports sponsorship by companies in the local/regional sector, should not be seen simply as an aspect of

corporate advertising, nor as the altruism of a regional patron, but that it was a mixture of these along with the political concerns of corporate interests in the maintenance of the industrial and social infrastructure. It was this complexity of interests which formed the basis of negotiation for sponsorship between sponsors, sports bodies and other institutions. This seems to have been developed in a pragmatic and largely unco-ordinated fashion though with local branches of industry leading the way. The general tendency in British industry since the 1960s has been towards concentration and mergers encouraged by central government policy, and sponsorship as an advertising tool has become an acceptable practice for the national corporations and their local subsidiaries. Within the broad parameters of corporate commitment to allocate a percentage of advertising budgets to sponsorship to foster the kind of company image desired, then local units appear to have been given some autonomy in negotiating the details of sponsorship with relevant bodies (128).

The perception and reaction to sponsorship by regional bodies (the West Midlands Regional Sports Council and the West Midlands County Council) and local authority departments of recreation has generally been supportive of its practice and development. Whilst the degree and level of active involvement and commitment to sponsorship has been variable it appears that most of the relevant institutions have regarded it as a good thing, or at least that it is an inevitable development. However, examination of the differences in responses to sponsorship serves to raise questions about the hidden messages in what appears to be a neutral phenomenon. If institutions have been enthusiastically encouraging the development of sponsorship in which direction has this been moved? Where little has been done towards the development of sponsorship does this signify that those institutions have been resisting or avoiding involvement or merely focusing on other priorities? Has any discernible political or ideological position been

conveyed - explicitly or implicitly?

The local link with the national promotion of sponsorship in the 1980s has been through regional sports councils and they have taken on the role of 'catalyst and broker' advising sports organisations, clubs and individuals how to sell themselves to potential sponsors in business terms (129). The Howell Report (1983) indicated that regional councils for sport and recreation made a significant contribution towards the encouragement of sponsorship at regional and local level and that this work should remain a high priority. However, in the West Midlands whilst periodical events have been held since 1984 bringing business representatives together, an advisory service maintained, and the administration of the Tarmac School of Sport undertaken, sponsorship has not really been given a 'high' priority. It appears that it has been a case of 'fitting it in to other demands of technical and administrative staff' (130). The general approach towards sponsorship seems to have been to utilise it for the benefit of local sport as a whole. But no special consideration appears to have been given resulting in policy statements which aimed to shift resources to disadvantaged groups - to the unemployed, women, or ethnic minorities. Instead the ethic of 'competitive individualism' has been sustained through focusing on the process of how to get sponsorship rather than the ends for which it might be used. Sponsorship seems to have been separated from other work which related to a clear focus on targeting on the disadvantaged in, for example, the Regional Sports Council's co-ordination of Action Sport schemes in the West Midlands metropolitan areas. The significance of this is that what sponsorship stands for is taken-for-granted as a relationship between sponsor and sponsored in commercial terms. Hence it has not been seen by the regional council staff as a phenomenon to be linked to other social objectives in community sports provision and development. These actually appear to be more of a priority in the context of inner-city regeneration in the

second-half of the 1980s. The effect is to abandon 'sponsorship' to the forces of the radical Right as a market and capitalist phenomenon.

The response to sponsorship within the Metropolitan Boroughs of the West Midlands can be characterised by identifying three approaches which have been followed. Firstly, the attempt to promote links between municipality and local industry as a means of providing facilities on a regional and community scale; secondly, the liaison between local authority and companies in the financing, organisation and operation of local events such as festivals and marathons; and thirdly, where the local authority itself takes on the role of sponsor in making municipal amenities available for specific occasions. On the whole there were few firm links of great significance between industry and municipality in the West Midlands relating to sponsorship by 1984. Part of the explanation for this may be that sponsorship was still a developing phenomenon which had not been fully considered and exploited by local authorities. But perhaps a more fundamental reason was that traditionally there has been a public policy of hostility to business and particularly in the case of Labour-led local authorities. In 1984 five of the seven metropolitan boroughs of the West Midlands were Labour-controlled and one of the two conservative councils had been a long-standing Labour borough. Sponsorship was something that chairmen and directors of leisure services of these boroughs recognised as something which occurred in their areas but this seemed to be on the fringes of their concerns and responsibilities. It was not 'up-front' in their consciousness.

One authority, Birmingham City Council, could be regarded as an exception to this pattern in that, although in the early stages of development, it had begun to formulate policy approaches towards business-municipality contact which involved sponsorship in ways that fitted in to a Labour-led council programme where provision of leisure

facilities was seen primarily as a responsibility of the local authority rather than business or voluntary organisations. Indeed, in the context of industrial recession in the Midlands a number of firms were attempting to sell off recreational land, and the City Council had, accordingly, set out a policy of buying sports grounds from the private sector to be run by the local authority (131). Sponsorship was negotiated for facilities planned by the Birmingham Recreation and Community Department including a major sponsor for a new stadium and a sponsor for equipping a leisure centre (132). The Council seemed to be pragmatic about the means of gaining resources and saw links with industry as the basis of a new local economic initiative. As the Birmingham Labour Party stated in its manifesto for the District Council elections in 1984

We must get all the financial resources we can from the EEC, from Central Government and from large industry wanting to invest in Birmingham. We need the full support of MPs, the MEPs, the business community in Birmingham and the trade unions, to help us pressurise the mandarins of Whitehall. Birmingham is now an area of high unemployment, it must not be by-passed by others (133).

Recreation and Community Services in Birmingham has indeed been the focus for regeneration as much as any other departmental area. The Guardian reported in 1986 that

The Recreation and Community Department's capital expenditure programme for the next six years is a staggering £715 million ... brave, brash Brum ... shoots for the Olympics, a national Exhibition Centre capable of hosting the nations of the world, a new £22 million national indoor arena, the biggest sports and arts complex in Western Europe, and a Monaco-style grand prix motor race (134).

In a number of respects Birmingham City Council seemed to be in line with what Paul Hirst (1988) described as the 'new politics of industrial renewal' in attempting 'to create industrial districts, a "public

sphere" for regions and industries and collaborative networks' in which the municipality played a part in 'orchestrating, collaborating and bargaining with business, and teasing out of civil society the particular focus and needs of communities' (135). Seen in this frame of reference sponsorship would appear to take on more than a marketing significance for a particular company or some financial benefit for an individual event or sports organisation. It could be utilised in a more far reaching socialist enterprise. However, Birmingham's plans in 1988 were still in a relatively embryonic stage and operating in a political context of Conservative state centralism and free-market policies which worked directly against local and regional initiatives. Furthermore, as indicated in Chapter Four, in relation to socialist aims there would appear to be certain limitations in the way that leisure services were conceived and promoted by Birmingham's Director of Recreation and Community Services. These were presented in idealistic but also opportunistic and top-down management terms with an emphasis on 'leisure consumers of desirable activities' rather than, for instance, the needs of women, ethnic minorities and other disadvantaged groups (136). Having said this, the political environment in which sponsorship was being negotiated in Birmingham during the mid to late 1980s seemed to be more pro-active than the other West Midlands metropolitan boroughs.

In the other six boroughs - Coventry, Dudley, Sandwell, Solihull, Walsall and Wolverhampton - approaches to sponsorship tended to occupy a relatively peripheral place, and fell into the categories of liaison between local authority and business firm for occasional jointly-planned local events, or local authority provision of municipal amenities for events which were mainly initiated by other bodies. One of the main factors influencing the reactions of these authorities appeared to be a narrow provincialism where sponsorship was regarded for how it might encourage companies to promote those individual boroughs. This was particularly the position of Leisure Services in Wolverhampton in

1983-84 (137). The involvement of officers of the Coventry Recreation Department with the Coventry Carnival Committee, which received sponsorship from a number of firms, was also valued for its financial return of £1 in every £3. A further factor in the perception of local authorities towards sponsorship was the realisation that the economic recession and the particular demography of the West Midlands made sponsorship of any significance difficult to obtain, and that the major sponsors - banks, building societies and the media - tended to be 'those making a profit' (138). However, the most striking response was that the metropolitan boroughs tended not to be actively or energetically looking to develop business links - perhaps Birmingham City Council apart - and that sponsorship was not a priority in the programmes of leisure services departments. But this did not mean that there was opposition to business. In certain cases there appeared to be a lukewarm reaction perhaps indicative of antipathy to industry in some sections of Labour councils, yet public provision for sport and recreation has generally complemented rather than competed with private sector initiatives.

Indeed, sport as an aspect of consumption has been promoted by local state leisure and recreation since the early 1970s as much as by sports entrepreneurs and the advertising industry. Through the provision of a range of facilities and the organisation of activities recreation management in the regional and local sectors makes a major contribution to the commodification of sport whereby participation becomes conceived in market terms as product and consumable. In this process experiences obtained from physical activity through local provision may be incorporated by media-sport professionals, sports agents and commercial sponsors. The image of physical fitness is sold by advertisers of various products, the interest in sporting performance is turned into media quiz-games, the need and desire for financial backing for organised events is exploited by companies as a marketing

medium. This may not be the case for all aspects of physical recreation. There are surely in the late 1980s a number of situations and settings where interest in sport and physical recreation can be undertaken away from and without reference to the forms and values of commercialised and commodified influences - e.g. the family swimming excursion, the primary school football match. Furthermore, manufacturers and businesses may not be able to completely determine the ways in which sports products and experiences are used. However, these apparently spontaneous and freely chosen pursuits at a low-level of performance and competition may not be so detached from the structural dimensions of the consumerism of sport. Not only must one 'enter the market as a consumer before being able to modify the meaning and use of a commodity' (Clarke and Critcher, 1985, p.201) but the individual and spontaneous choices themselves tend to be dominated by market and privatised forms. Some of the underlying processes and implications have been summarised by John Hargreaves (1986) who argues

It is precisely the autonomy of consumer culture and of sports as a cultural formation, which facilitates the displacement of economic and political struggle to this region ... Sport is increasingly sold as a family-orientated activity ... In this manner one of the main thrusts of sporting activity coincides with that of consumer culture, namely the recomposition of the working class and sub-ordinate groups as an aggregate of privatised family consumption units, a network of discrete gender and age-structured units for the production of normalised individuals ... and one of the main ways in which the promise of youth is held out to the older generation by consumer culture is through the promotion of sporting activity. It is a process in which the media play a key part in bringing off this aspect of accommodation. The linkage between culture and sport then, does not represent an emancipation from control: it is about the joy of subjecting the body to continual sensation, of one's own will. The uncompromising quality of the jogging cult, for example, and the imperative encoded in the way that highly erotic advertising depicts the body ('get undressed - but be good-looking slim and tanned') attest to the formidable regimen of discipline and surveillance that this culture can entail (139).

The penetration of sport as a commodified form has also become evident at the school level, where the sponsorship of sport and physical education has been developed during the 1970s and 1980s in line with the general interest of business in exploring the area of cultural activity as a means of getting to potential consumers - the young and old, child and adult, pupil and parent. The particular focus here has been the link with the physical education programme through the sponsorship of governing body 'award schemes'. The involvement in this education sphere of large multi-national companies - like Coca-Cola and Esso - was noted earlier in the chapter. A further notable involvement has been that of Heinz who in the early 1980's engaged in a massive national campaign to market their product through school sport and physical education. This was more direct advertising than sponsorship of a sports event, in that H.J. Heinz Co. Ltd established a Schools Foundation with the stated aim of helping provide schools with some of the extra curricula equipment that it was thought 'they may need at a period of financial restraint' (140). The equipment presented included play-group material, and music and visual aid items, but especially featured sports goods from the suppliers Lillywhites. The selling ploy was that many hundred thousand pounds worth of equipment would be offered to participating schools free of charge in exchange for labels from Heinz products. This was a case of a well known firm- according to Heinz the average family buys more than 80 of their products in the course of a year (141) - making capital out of the restrictions placed on public spending cuts in education by a Conservative government. They were using the sporting and extra curricula needs of schools as a means of selling their products. Labels on products drew on sporting super-stars like Kevin Keegan to exhort the buyer to 'help your school

get the things it needs' illustrating some of the free sports items being made available. Sport was thus singled out in the community context of schools for commercial exploitation. Funds which were normally spent on other methods of advertising and promotion were, for a period, diverted to schools, and the scheme was featured on more than 90 million units of products on sale through the autumn of 1980. Public response to the scheme as reflected on the B.B.C. Radio 4 programme 'You and Yours' (142) indicated that a number of the listeners selected applauded the scheme as a worthy assistance to schools, though some critical comments were also presented. These made the point that it was using children to bring pressure on parents (to purchase quantities of Heinz products). Neil Kinnock, Labour M.P. for Bedwelty, and then Shadow Education spokesman, was also interviewed and expressed his general unease about the implications of schools being placed in a position of having to rely on business philanthropy for equipment. However, this only partially grasped the point, for what this and other sponsorship and advertising schemes signify is the encroachment of commercialism, privatisation and commodification in people's lives.

Indeed, freedom of choice in leisure and the extent to which individuals can engage in recreation and physical pastimes even at local, non-competitive, friendly and spontaneous levels may appear to be more real than is the case. Although Hargreaves' comments seem to be over-deterministic they underline - as does Inglis (1977) and Clarke and Critcher (1985) - the power of structural forces and the deep penetration of the ideology of consumer values in capitalist societies, so that expansion of commercialism at elite and national levels has an effect on people in their lives as a whole. The power of the media, government institutions, sports entrepreneurs and agents, recreation management professionals and the 'health and fitness industry' combine to set conditions, limit the scope for choice and frame the meaning and significance of participation in sport and recreation. In the context

of the construction of sport around the growing domination of Thatcherist policies in the 1980s its commercial and commodified character was extended. Although sponsorship at the regional/local levels appeared to indicate a contrast with the more explicit acquisitive and privatised features of the national and elite sphere peoples experiences, perceptions and values in relation to sport have been shaped by those major forms of sponsorship.

This examination of business sponsorship of sport at national level, and in regional and local settings, confirms that the greater concentration of commercial funds are invested at a national and elite level with selected sports. Although there is an interest shown by some multi-nationals in schools, and by local industries in community events, these are much less in evidence. The attraction of opportunities for national and international advertisement through the media coverage of key sports events is the most prevalent pattern. Nevertheless, sponsorship in sport is a developing practice, which covers a wide area of sports, and increasingly in local as well as national contexts. It has the support of the state - from Ministers and the state aided Sports Council, and the sports voluntary representatives - the Central Council of Physical Recreation and the governing bodies. There seems to be a general acceptance that sports events and activities would naturally include the presence of a sponsor from one business firm or another. Tobacco companies in particular have played a significant role in identifying sport as a means of advertising their products and presenting a respectable image. This has increasingly become a source of tension in the 1980s as attacks on smoking have intensified. The acceptance of sponsorship in the popular consciousness as a desirable cultural practice has the effect of legitimising the role of business in sport - and, by association, the approval of business values of a competitive market orientation, while simultaneously reproducing the unequal distribution of sponsorship funding to sport. Professional and

large scale sports have become the reference point for the subordinate mass physical recreation to relate.

Although it is recognised that some benefits may accrue to the bodies and individuals taking part in recreation pursuits and community activities as a result of local sponsorship; it is also apparent that the business sponsor has exercised greater control in this cultural sphere - by selecting certain areas over others, and by determining the guidelines for operation of events. Profit is bound to be the ultimate objective of commerce in a capitalist society - by definition - even though not all of the activities of business will be profit oriented all the time. However, profit is not the only or main factor in regard to the relationship between sport and business; but rather the control of commerce over culture as provider of resources, if not directly then through the threat of withdrawing those resources. The Commonwealth Games of 1986 highlighted the susceptibility of competitive sport to the sensitivities of commercial companies who may withdraw support when contentious political issues threaten attendance by some national teams. In this particular case it also increased the dependence of the sporting organisations on the benevolence of multi-millionaires capitalising on the publicity to be gained through media exposure (143). But at the local level, too, the concern of companies for association only with successful events favours the organised and conforming client.

The extent to which sponsorship has developed since the late 1960s cannot be explained only by entrepreneurial activity of business in gaining new advertising and promotional outlets, opportunities for building corporate images, or avenues for entertaining important contacts, nor by the endeavours of sports organisations. Also crucial in this movement has been the role of the state. The state funded sport and recreation sector expanded significantly from 1965 to the mid-1970s under both Labour and Conservative governments, but during the 1970s and

with greater intensity in the 1980s, greater reliance on private means was encouraged - through sponsorship and closer relationship with the business sector. Government ministers have played a part in this, as has the state aided Sports Council and voluntary body of the Central Council of Physical Recreation. This has to be seen as part of the wider political movement in which the Welfare State has been under attack from both Right and Left since the economic recession of the mid-1970s (144). The terrain on which the Sports Council operates has accordingly shifted away from its more social democratic origins towards 'an ethic of cost cutting and capitalistic efficiency' (145). Business sponsorship has been encouraged as an aspect of this commodification prioritisation led by the responses of the state to the pressures on capital accumulation.

However, this has caused problems for sport, because the business influence has threatened to undermine the autonomy and authority of the sports establishment. This trend has been identified by the former Minister for Sport, Denis Howell, whose Committee on Sports Sponsorship has attempted to regulate the role to be played by business firms and entrepreneurs. But ideologically this has remained at the level of a liberal response asserting the values of individual freedom, whilst in fact upholding the importance of private and business involvement within the framework of a dominant sports establishment opportunistically responding to the political pressures of market and private enterprise principles. Governing bodies have indeed used their freedom to become more skilled under the guidance of the Sports Council and C.C.P.R. in presenting their events in ways that anticipate the requirements of advertisers and sponsors, but this has served to draw sport more into the domain of commerce and the interests of corporate capital.

Indeed, as a result mainly of the growth of sponsorship sport has undergone significant changes since the 1960s both in structure and

organisation and in the way that it is perceived by the public. Bodies involved in the promotion and development of sport have been supplemented and diversified. In addition to physical educationists, sports administrators and recreation managers, the commercialisation of sport has involved and attracted sports agents and entrepreneurs, sports celebrities, media specialists, marketing experts and sponsorship advisors. The Sports Council has adapted to a 'more business-like approach' and marketing/management emphasis. In becoming more financially successful traditional sports like cricket and athletics have undergone changes in the nature of those activities by accommodating to media and sponsorship requirements. This has involved alterations in the length and style of game, e.g. in one-day cricket, and the payment of pace-makers who do not set out to win in attempts to create entertainment in athletic record-breaking events. Formerly working-class pastimes like snooker, and darts have emerged to be regarded as key sports in the hierarchy of top-sponsored media events, thus challenging the educationists categorisation of what counts as sport-based largely on the potential for physical vigour and/or moral virtues.

At the same time there were continuities in the forms and relationships in sport which seem to have been reinforced by the involvement of business. Although changes have been effected by the growth of sponsorship, the tendencies towards individual competitiveness, nationalism and sexism have been strengthened. The bulk of sponsorship funding is directed towards major national events where the media stresses individual and national achievements, the naturalness of Western forms of culture and practice, the glorification of outstanding athletes and the creation of super-stars. In addition the top sponsored sports - cricket, snooker and horse-racing - are male dominated, whilst major growth areas - such as snooker and darts - are predominantly working-class male activities. Opportunities for evaluating the

developments in sponsorship by the sports establishment have failed to identify women's unequal position in the distribution of resources in sport as a problem, whilst conditions set by sponsors or governing bodies in the negotiation of sponsorship relate heavily to television coverage and therefore accentuate the existing patriarchal values which already exist.

Finally, although the expansion of sponsorship as a form of company promotion signals the incorporation of sport into the orbit of economic organisations, it has been argued that where the collective political will exists to negotiate conditions on the terms of municipal socialist policies then it does not follow that sponsorship necessarily implies an acquisitive commercialism. However, the extent to which opposition parties or local authorities have given this possibility consideration during the 1980s has been limited. The forces of the radical Right on the other hand have identified sponsorship not simply as a 'marketing skill' but as an aspect of the 'private enterprise' culture, and through sports organisations the capitalist market ideological strategies of Thatcherism have been strengthened.

CHAPTER SIX
POLITICAL FUTURES

The Radical Right and Sports Policy for the 1990s

On 19 November, 1987 Colin Moynihan, Minister for Sport, officially opened up a public debate with the stated purpose of helping to shape sports policy for the 1990s. The Department of Environment announced on that date that its Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State had posed a series of questions on the future of sport in Britain, and had asked the Sports Council to play a key role in bringing together the views of all those interested in sport and recreation (1). This communique was a significant landmark, for it both confirmed the close control of the state over sports policy which had developed since the mid-1960s, and signalled the determination that this would be strengthened further in the future. In effect, the Minister for Sport was attempting to set the agenda for future directions in sports policy whilst appearing to be democratic. It was in reality as much a political statement as a declaration about the future of sport. Indeed, it was composed in the authoritarian populist style and ideological framework of a Thatcher Government seeking to consolidate its power and bring about further changes in institutions in line with its strategies for a privatised, individualist and entrepreneurial society.

In a speech in the House of Commons on 10 November, 1987 Moynihan's summary of aims of Government policy in sport focused on traditional themes of health, mass recreation and top-level competition. However, these were developed along the lines of Thatcherist strategic approaches to managing the economy in capitalist market terms, and in harmonising communities which were suffering from the effects of market policies. Sport and exercise were opportunistically valued for their capacity to

'reduce death rate from heart disease and the heavy call on health resources' at a time when public funding for the health service was being curtailed. Mass sport and recreation were also presented in terms of alleviating social deprivation. They were 'to be used as a policy tool in areas of high unemployment'. Claims were made that sport could provide a catalyst for channelling the energies of the young into 'constructive and satisfying activities contributing to their self esteem and discipline', and that it could contribute to 'community confidence and cohesion especially in pockets of social deprivation'. The concern to promote excellence and success in sport was justified because it 'reflected well on Britain's standing in the world and on trade and morale' (2). Moynihan, in a letter to the Chairman of the Sports Council, identified two key issues for the major organisations in sport to address: firstly, how sports bodies might more effectively deploy their resources suggesting concentration on either sporting excellence or wider participation, and secondly, how private sector investment in sport might be developed. More specific questions raised by the Minister for Sport included:

- (i) Should the Sports Council concentrate its grant-aid more towards community provision and especially to areas and groups of special need like the inner cities, youngsters, the unemployed and other target groups? Does this point to strengthening the Council's regional structure and to channelling more of its grant-in-aid to the regions? What more can the Council do, through its regional structure, to promote the involvement of local industry and commerce in sport? Has the Sports Aid Trust a potential role to play in this area?
- (ii) Should the Council develop more effective guidelines, advice and programmes for helping sports governing bodies to look more

effectively to the private sector for funding, thus freeing more resources for the Council's own community programme?

- (iii) Should the Council disengage itself from provision of support for elite competitors and leave this to governing bodies, the British Olympic Association and the Sports Aid Foundation? If there is a continuing need for a measure of public support for elite competitors, might it more effectively be channelled through a body such as B.O.A.?
- (iv) How far do changes of emphasis such as those set out above require changes in the Council's membership? Would the Council operate more effectively with a smaller membership?
- (v) How might the running of the National Sports Centres be improved? Should the Council look to bring in more competitive tendering to their operation? (3)

Questions were thus framed in an apparently open-ended way but with a particular slant informed by the thrust of broader Government policies. Such an approach reinforces the point made by Hall (1987), that Thatcherism did not make a single move which was not also carefully calculated in terms of its hegemonic strategy - of stepping up privatisation, providing an image of choice and attacking state services (4). The area of sports in this way also seemed to be subjected to political-ideological intervention which attempted to construct policy for the next decade.

Providing a perspective on what was happening in sport and setting out a vision for the future through a few clearly articulated themes as Moynihan had done was of critical importance, even if some of the concrete issues emanated from the Sports Council's own review, for it was concerned with exerting political control. And constructed as it was within the

coherent and increasingly popular political strategy of the 'entrepreneurial culture' it promised to take on a more significant dimension. In the 1960s and 1970s, Denis Howell, as the Labour Minister for Sport grasped the opportunity to formulate future developments for sport around the social-democratic principles of 'corporate planning' and 'welfare' and established a pattern for the instrumental use of sport by the state. The Conservatives in the 1980s, through their statutory power and through their clear ideological strategies appeared to be extending this central control of sports policy further, and thereby influencing the direction of change. It was not that the Conservatives had a formally agreed written party policy on sport, but that through ministerial initiatives a centrally directed thrust was exerted picking up on concerns of sports bodies and interpreting these in ways which seemed to contribute to the Thatcherist project. In this context the Moynihan initiative was significant. It implicitly sought to determine which future possibilities would be realised and which would be rejected as unsuitable.

The implications of the focus by Moynihan on changes in organisation and an increased role for the private sector appear likely to increase rather than reduce social divisions, whilst providing no guarantee of accommodating subordinate to dominant groups. The trends of the 1980s have indicated that unemployment has not been distributed randomly, but has fallen unequally on the working class, women, ethnic minorities, the young and the over 50s (5). Directing more sporting resources towards the unemployed actually serves to maintain this unequal system since it helps mask the structural causes of unemployment and the social basis of disadvantage. Unless it is accompanied by an empowerment of these targeted groups then improved facilities are likely to do little more than underline the frustrations of deprived communities. In addition, the involvement of local industry and commerce in sport is not

likely to be implemented without bargaining between the interests of local groups and business. Although this might be an opportunity for the Left to appropriate the generic meaning of the free market through such themes as 'the growing diversity of society, the widening of access, the empowerment of ordinary people through their "right to choose"' (Hall, 1988) (6), the neo-liberalism of the Right and the forces of business capitalist interests could continue to dominate, if not at the local level of sports provision then in the wider market place of sports promotion of goods and services. Indeed, municipal provision of sport, even if assisted by industry, could be essentially 'compensatory remedying deficiencies in the provision made by the market, leaving its operations otherwise impeded' (Clarke and Critcher, 1985) (7). In addition, the trend towards privatisation and the boom in an expensive private sector in sport may exacerbate the difference between private provision for the wealthy few and relatively impoverished amenities for the majority. Overall, the concern expressed by Moynihan about social deprivation emphasises organisational and financial remedial measures underpinned by scrutiny and control - a futuristic 'rational recreation', rather than pinpointing causes and identifying community needs. However, he assumes that sport in general has the capacity to achieve accommodation of subordinate groups to the dominant social order. But what has become evident about sport since the 1960s is the transformation that has taken place under political, commercial and social influences increasing its diversity through processes of politicisation, commodification and intensification of competition. Government intervention over the Moscow Olympic Games and crowd behaviour in football, the continued involvement of individual elite performers with sport in South Africa, the violence in certain sports and the increased use of drugs have 'made sport problematic as an area for legitimisation' (Hargreaves, 1986) (8). The involvement of sports agents and advertising professionals, and the growth of media

interest and influence also means that the public perceive sport as 'entertainment' or a form of 'consumer activity' as much as 'community participation'. Indeed, in 1987 the Sports Council acknowledged the difficulties of bringing in 'new' participants to sport, and with the C.C.P.R. have directed attention on schools and the younger age-groups in community centres as it has become evident that 'attempts to attract school-leavers will usually be misplaced, since by the age of 16+ personal attitudes in sport in general, and to specific activities are already well entrenched' (9).

It is not inevitable that the future will be dominated by an entrepreneurial culture on the lines of Thatcherism even though the capitalist concentration of power and control appear to be firmly installed in the late 1980s and may seem likely to increase. There are other possible outcomes which might be constructed and these need to be considered. Firstly, the autonomous character of sport could become assertive. Sports organisations, including the Sports Council, C.C.P.R. and governing bodies may reject some of the Government's proposals for sports policy in the 1990s. There have been occasions in the past when governing bodies and athletes have made a stand against the wishes of government ministers - for example, in regard to the British Olympic Association's decision to allow athletes to compete in the 1980 Moscow Olympics despite strong government pressure. However, the tendency for sports organisations to maintain the right to run their own affairs and to choose the conditions under which they develop policy does not necessarily signify any far-reaching political resistance. As argued in Chapters Three and Five, the liberal traditions of sport may lead to an independence which seeks to develop links with business and provide community recreation in ways which serve to maintain and promote conservative political interests. Organisations may freely choose to do

what dominant interests desire. The hegemonic power of Thatcherism would then be maintained through the strength of its ideological work in making greater reliance on the private sector and contributions towards the regeneration of inner cities through recreation programming appear reasonable objectives, which should be approached within the entrepreneurial orientation of the radical Right. But, in any case, there is no guarantee that the formal traditional governing bodies and councils will be the key institutions to be consulted by government ministers. They may be bypassed through the establishment of new consultative groups set up by government departments. For instance, in March 1988 Minister for Sport, Colin Moynihan, announced a major review of sport and recreation provision in inner cities to be carried out by a nominated group of 'seven leading businessmen, athletes and sports administrators' under his chairmanship (10). The close government monitoring and, in addition, Mrs Thatcher's personal interest was made evident in Moynihan's reference to the Prime Minister's foreword to 'Action for Cities' which indicated that the Government's comprehensive approach to improving life in the inner cities included help with improving sport and recreation facilities (11). Thus whilst the autonomy of sport is a factor to be taken into account in considering political futures, it is also necessary to recognise how that apparent freedom can be ideologically shaped, incorporated or utilised by centrally directed initiatives.

Secondly, it is important to appreciate that statist action does not imply support for the Government of the day nor working for the continuation of Thatcherism. Conflict between central and local government has been a feature of the 1980s and various forms of municipal socialism have been developed in, for example, London, Sheffield, Birmingham and Wolverhampton, as indicated in previous chapters. The G.L.C. (1982-85) provided a model of how leisure, recreation, arts, and

sport could be part of a programme which emphasised community needs through positive discrimination and decentralisation with particular priority given to the establishment of a 'womens committee' (12). In Sheffield, the Labour Council have more recently attempted to negotiate sponsorship for its hosting of the 1991 World Student Games in ways which could ultimately benefit grass roots sport in the region (13)..

Birmingham City Council also seemed to be pragmatically developing links with industry from the mid-1980s in relation to local community welfare initiatives (14). Wolverhampton Metropolitan Borough Council had endorsed a review of policy for youth in 1985 undertaken by a team of sociologists under the direction of Paul Willis which established clear egalitarian and democratic principles for youth provision in the borough (15). However, these seem to be fragmented and unco-ordinated within the Labour movement as a whole. Indeed, in the late 1980s Labour is at a very early and tentative stage in the process of rethinking its goals and purposes which as Hall (1988) argues is an absolute pre-requisite to any possible renewal of the project of the Left. Hall points out that

Labour has no moral agenda of its own
except an inherited conservative one.
Consequently it is not a force that
is actively shaping the culture,
educating desire (16).

In similar vein, Hobsbawm (1988) in analysing the initial policy documents of aims and principles by Kinnock and Hattersley, Blunkett and Crick, and Benn maintains that Labour's thinking displays weaknesses of provincialism and fails to emphasise 'public purpose' and 'common interest' in building a socialist alternative to the 'market' and 'private profit' (17). Hence, although strong conservative central state control does not mean that power has been uncontested, it has been made more effective because of the limited understanding and agreement about the ideological purposes of the opposition, and Labour in particular. Sport and recreation has likewise

lacked a reconsidered perspective and lead from within the Labour movement (18).

The importance of developing an ideological project points to a third factor, the changing of values in civil society and beyond the state alone. This points up the significance of a cultural politics. Hall (1984) drawing on Gramsci has identified possible indications in popular culture of how, for example, spontaneous interests in health and fitness, marathon running and aerobics seem to indicate connections with wider concerns about threats to the environment, and a politics of ecology (19). Whannel (1983) and Hargreaves (1986) also make similar points about the more egalitarian aspects of sport evident in popular interest in jogging and marathon running in the 1980s. However, the limited extent to which the political significance of these activities seemed to have been recognised or taken up by other groups on the Left by the late 1980s raises questions both about the clarity of vision of the Left in failing to see the importance and scope of a wider cultural politics, and of the difficulties in countering the tendency for popular interests to be incorporated into mainstream and commercially oriented sport. Indeed, health and body maintenance has expanded as an industry since the 1970s spawning private and commercial health clubs, saunas, health farms, body shops, solariums, along with the business of manufacturing equipment, constructing dietary schedules and producing publications on health. The importance of a cultural politics is not rendered less significant by the lack of awareness and organisation on the Left, or the opportunism of commercial interests. In fact, it underlines how far-reaching an understanding of cultural change becomes as a pre-requisite for social and political action. The issue for Hall is to recognise the fruits of modern industry and people's material and concrete aspirations, but to expropriate them from identification with the private market and private

appropriation (20). In this context the task for socialism would be to challenge the capitalist market and consumer way of life, but to more clearly identify and articulate what that might be replaced by. Analysis of sport as a cultural experience may have something to contribute to the wider project of action for a socialist political future.

Among a range of issues surrounding sport in Thatcher's capitalist Britain there are three areas where the need for change would seem particularly important in conceptualising a socialist political future. These include questions relating to gender, nationalism and the control and use of time. It is an indication of the inequality in the administration and decision making bodies, that of the seven individuals selected in 1988 by Minister of Sport, Colin Moynihan, to review sport and recreation provision in inner cities only one was a woman (21). This imbalance of representation by sex was not an uncommon pattern in the 1980s when women were still generally excluded from positions of power in sport. Jennifer Hargreaves (1984) referred to the 'paranoid hostility towards an increase in female participation' in the Olympic movement and that the International Olympic Committee had remained an elite and exclusively male body from the foundation of the modern Olympics in 1896. In 1984 its membership was composed of 86 men and only 3 women (22). The British Sports Council also only included 4 women in its 35 strong committee in 1986-87 (23). Despite developments in recent years which have provided Olympic events for women in a wide range of sports, and the Sport's Council's policy of targeting on girls and women as a means of increasing participation, male orientation and domination in sport has been maintained. Indeed, as John Hargreaves (1986) points out 'sport constitutes one of the major bases of male hegemony' (24). A patriarchal approach was tacitly adopted during the years of Labour control and influence in the direction of sports policy in the 1960s and 1970s when

the liberal Fabian version of planning assumed domination over its radical campaigning energies. But even on the radical Left masculinity tends not to be adequately problematised. As Cynthia Cockburn (1988) argues the issue of gender often seems to be 'an optional extra we can embroider into our socialist analysis' (25). For the future more is involved than changes in provision to allow subordinate groups access to certain sports activities or, indeed, to membership of decision making bodies. The organisation and management of sport is infused by elements of sexism. However, as Gramsci emphasised

building for a socialist future was not a question of introducing from scratch a scientific form of thought into everyone's individual life, but of renovating and making 'critical' an already existing activity (26).

In this respect socialist and feminist ways of thinking would be required at the various levels of sports administration and in developing ways of providing sport in relation to women's needs in inner cities and other communities. This would mean not just the provision of creches and spaces of time for women in recreation centres, but a more fundamental challenge to the 'social gender that men have learned to live'. It would call for 'collective consciousness raising work' and involve a 'political commitment of thought and intention, time and resources' (27).

The nationalism historically associated with sport is a second characteristic which needs to be made problematic, for nation in British society denotes a continuity of establishment conservative domination. The ruling class has largely managed to deploy popular nationalism for its own political ends through successive phases of imperial expansion from the 17th century, and sport has been incorporated into this bourgeois hegemony. British sporting practices and institutions were established on

a world-wide basis and international sports federations were set up during the 19th and early 20th century under the leadership of upper and middle class groups. The traditions and subsequent patterns for international sport were indeed created by the white Western world controlled by an aristocracy. The International Olympic Committee has had strong white male Anglo-Saxon aristocratic foundations from its inauguration. In the 1960s and 1970s the Labour Minister for Sport in policy statements justified the allocation of financial resources towards elite performers on the basis of 'national prestige' and 'national unity'. The effect on 'national morale' was stressed and clubs and other bodies were expected 'to give priority to international calls over local interests' (28). There was little evidence of any challenge to the conservative notion of nationhood which has been largely chauvinistic and ethnocentric. Thatcherism has exploited popular chauvinism appealing to national pride and loyalty on both economic and political issues. It has provided an opportunity for presenting an image of overcoming Britain's decline through a return to Victorian entrepreneurial values and of invoking a sense of national unity. Conservative Minister for Sport, Colin Moynihan's justification for the promotion of excellence and success in sport in 1987 was similarly constructed in economic and political terms - in relation to 'Britain's standing in the world and for trade and morale' (29). However, although empire and chauvinism may be strongly entrenched in popular common-sense, this could be appropriated and reshaped in socialist terms in Britain even if seen as a difficult task requiring long-term strategies. Such a project would require shifting the popular conception of nation towards a more open, democratic view, one which could 'encompass new identities and aspirations in different sections of people' (30). It would entail in sport a questioning of the kind of nation produced by existing sporting practices. It would need to raise awareness of how class, gender and ethnic divisions are reproduced in sport to help

overcome class domination, patriarchy and racism. It would also require re-examination of the nature of competition at national and international level. Should this, for instance, be less about national prestige and more about the coming together of nations for more friendly, co-operative and informal events. As Whannel (1983) points out

Even at the highest level sport can be performed with great enjoyment and mutual respect. It can also be real entertainment as opposed to mere spectacle. We need to explore ways of promoting the positive aspects of competition and diminishing the negative ones which often predominate at present (31).

In addition, it would be important to consider which sports should be encouraged and resourced. A more just and caring approach to provision would surely need to give priority to mass popular sports, to sports which appealed to women and to ethnic minorities. But the complexities of sporting activities would also need to be taken into account as Whannel points out. For example, should cruel sports like hunting and harmful sports like boxing be promoted in socialist policies?

The third issue to be highlighted is 'control and use of time'. As Clarke and Critcher argue, efforts to repress and exclude 'undesirable' uses of free time and to encourage 'civilising' and 'profitable' activities have been a continuous part of the development of leisure in Britain. Indeed, leisure has been 'integral to the struggle for hegemony in British society' and sport and recreation has been a prominent part of this 'cultural conflict over meanings, views of the world and social habits' (32). Particular focus has been given in this study to the service performed for the state by organised physical activities in helping maintain the legitimization of liberal capitalism. The formation of the C.C.R.P.T. in 1935 and its promotion of recreative physical training

reproduced the purpose of physical pursuits in terms of predominantly liberal progressive ideals of 'self help' and 'self improvement', and conservative authoritarian values of 'self discipline' and 'training'. The second world-war period and the late 1940s saw a continuation of the close connections between the C.C.R.P.T. and the state with an emphasis on 'service' and 'citizenship', 'responsibility' and 'duty'. The 1950s was significant for establishment attempts to cope with the emergence of working-class youth as a social force. The recommendation of the Wolfenden Committee to set up an advisory Sports Council was launched in a context of concerns - indicated also in the Crowther and Albemarle reports - of how youth would spend the predicted increase in leisure time. In the 1960s and 1970s the rational recreation theme has been pursued through the policies of Sports Council and local authorities in targeting on particular groups. More recently the involvement of business in sport and the growth of a sports industry has shifted the balance of control from 'prohibitive denying techniques to more productive, expansive and positive stimulation' linked to the spread of consumer culture (33). As the consumption of leisure goods and services, including the sporting forms, has moved to a more central role in the capitalist economy so it has become more important for socialism as a movement to understand its significance. As Clarke and Critcher point out

Any alternatives to the market model at home or abroad are dismissed because they threaten to diminish 'consumer choice'. This ideological use of leisure equates the public interest with the pursuit of private gain by both seller and buyer. Leisure is the perfect model of the free play of market forces, to which other systems - of health, housing and education - are being made to approximate. The only role of public provision is either as indirect subsidy to commercial activity or as compensation for those too inadequate to compete in the market-place of consumption (34).

The concerns of Colin Moynihan with emphasising the role of business and private funding in the context of public provision in sport exemplifies the new Right strategy of disciplining the mainly working-class young whilst bringing market forces to bear on the public sector. The establishment's interest in controlling the use of time through sport has continued, but the means of achieving this has shifted. The task for socialism in reversing the liberal-conservative domination of the way sport is seen and justified is a massive one. It would seem to involve redirecting public resources to those in most need. It would surely demand professional workers in sport and recreation creating significant roles for community groups in sport. It might encompass greater control over how time can be made available and therefore leisure and sport would need to be linked more closely with the sharing of work. And it could call for sport and recreation being a means of enjoyable activity whilst being also a part of socialist political activity where families, friends, colleagues and communities met to play and engage in discussion and demonstration.

However, despite the importance of rethinking possible future policy directions in sport in alternative and oppositional ways to the conservative/liberal definitions there would be dangers in applying an ideal kind of socialism to sport in a crude instrumental way. As Hargreaves (1986) reminds us, such a stance would be to 'devalue sport as an autonomous means of expression' and indeed be likely to 'alienate the subordinate groups which would be its targets' (35). Clearly, there would be no advancement if more of the same was produced, though in the name of socialism. Nevertheless, if a different kind of society and sport is to be developed then the issues of gender, nationalism and the fairer construction of time would surely need to be taken into account.

Hargreaves also points out that analysis and critical reflection, though important, should be seen as only a preliminary to a discursive process - that of policy formation. He maintains that

Policy cannot automatically be deduced from analysis: its formation is a creative process requiring imaginative leaps, and above all, a genuine interaction between policy-makers and subjects (36).

This chapter takes his point into account, but attempts to further the objective of critical analysis as a necessary pre-requisite; through an extension of the discussion of political futures in relation to sport drawing on the theoretical perspectives identified in Chapter One. It then returns to consider the matter of policy formation with reference to the evidence provided by this study.

Sport and Theoretical Perspectives on the Future

Three theoretical approaches to the state were pinpointed and examined in the opening chapter as a means of providing an analytical framework for explaining and understanding the changes which have occurred in sport from 1960 to the mid-1980s. In considering political futures in relation to sport it is appropriate to refer back to those theoretical perspectives of pluralism, social reproduction and culturalism to address the distinctive forward approaches that can be taken and to evaluate what each offers.

The pluralist perspective was analysed through the work of Kenneth Roberts (1978 and 1981) writing in the sociology of leisure (37). It is also relevant here to include, in addition, a more recent study by Tony Veal whose book Leisure and the Future (1987) reflects a pluralistic approach to leisure forecasting in that it assembles a range of ideas of

future directions whilst essentially accepting the continuation of a liberal capitalist system (38). Taken together Roberts and Veal identify a number of accounts of probable futures for the relevance this might have in throwing light on the significance and potential role of leisure. But the approach adopted is essentially uncritical. Roberts in Leisure (1981) argues that assessing probable futures cannot be more than best estimates and that no one can claim the last word. He asserts that everyone with sufficient interest is entitled to form their own conclusions (39). Whilst this may be so the inference here seems to be that because no one assessment might turn out to be a correct one that all are equally appropriate or worthy. The modus operandi is to estimate likely futures rather than to fully evaluate the different schools of thought for the political values inherent in them. Where Roberts does show a preference he takes a middle position between the optimism of the post-industrial society thesis elaborated by Bennis and Slater (1968), Toffler (1970), Halmos (1970), Touraine (1971), Bell (1974) (40), and the pessimistic scenario of the Limits to Growth thesis of Mises (1977) Hirsch (1977), Tiryakian (1978) and Illich (1978) (41). In effect, he sees a continuity with the society of the 1980s in which leisure does not replace work and the age-old problem of scarcity. Roberts predicts that the society with rather than of leisure will be the most likely outcome, but that this suggests the possibility of 'a genuine reappraisal' of work. He suggests that although only a part of life, leisure may offer enough opportunity for fulfilment to make instrumental goals sufficient reason for working.

However, the analysis that Roberts provides of a re-appraisal of work is only partial. He seems to welcome the possibilities of the breakdown in the old Protestant ethic's assumption that work ought to be fulfilling on the basis of a greater reality that much work is boring and that many workers will be motivated primarily by extrinsic rewards. But

he hardly examines the dynamics and causes behind the creation and distribution of employment. Indeed, predictions of the growth of leisure seem to be valued for the function it might serve in maintaining the capitalist system which produces unequal prospects for labour. It is fair to say that Roberts does not crudely indicate that leisure can resolve structural inequalities. As he indicates,

Women need liberating from gender constraints,
poor people need money and the unemployed
need jobs, not specially designed leisure
services. Leisure is not overriding, but
confirming our need to tackle long-standing
problems rooted in the ageing process,
inequalities in industry and income
distribution and the domestic division of
labour. If these issues can be resolved,
leisure will largely take care of itself (42).

However, the underlying reasons for these inequalities seem not to be located in the class nature of capitalist society but as dislocations which somehow need to be overcome without disequilibrium to that system. Leisure and sport are seen as complex phenomena developing alongside other social forces and 'substantially independent of the larger political economy' (43). Although Roberts provides an overview of theoretical contributions to futures and the place of leisure in frameworks like the post-industrial society he gives few guidelines of an explanatory nature. His recommendation on recreation provision for the present - and therefore in preparing the way for the future - is that decisions on levels and forms of provision must continue to depend heavily on the 'common-sense of democratically elected representatives' (44). Such an approach offers no way of grasping the power dimensions of sport. What is required is an analysis of social class and ideological influences which the pluralist model largely eschews.

Veal whilst providing a comprehensive survey of ideas relating to the future of leisure also tends to lack penetration and direction in his analysis. He makes an appraisal of the post-industrial society thesis, changing attitudes to work, and party political dimensions, but chooses to stand back from any commitment to a specific goal or purpose. As he says, in his introduction to Leisure and the Future

The aim of the book is not to advocate one particular view. I have attempted to review and reflect the state of the art and to illustrate that whenever there is a firmly held, even dogmatic, view about the way the future will develop a contrary view can be found which is believed just as firmly and can be argued just as convincingly (45).

The problem with this approach is that whilst a range of views are presented with some definitive elaborations, the absence of a critical theoretical perspective with which to evaluate those views leads to a superficial treatment. With regard to the post-industrial society the concern is to focus on whether there is a consensus of views, and what might happen in the future, rather than what is unjust or unequal about a particular future position. The question for him is whether the 'service society' (Bell) or 'information society' (Stonier) of the future would be 'primarily work-like or primarily leisure-like' (46). It is true that Veal contrasts, for example, Bell's and Stonier's characterisation of the post-industrial society with critics like Kumar who stresses the continuities within the basic system of the developing capitalist industrial society (47), but the significance and implications of these points are not developed. And even where the mechanisms of change are addressed through an examination of attitudes to work and work-sharing, and of political dimensions, these are presented in a survey-like manner rather than penetrating to the underlying ideological meaning of value positions or the contradictory features of political movements.

However, whilst Veal seems to be uncommitted to one particular account of the future this does not mean he cannot be identified with a political perspective. His pluralistic stance actually conveys a liberal approach in which certain key issues are largely ignored. Although there is a considerable amount of material amassed on the concept of 'time' this tends to focus on abstract notions of attitudes to work and the work-leisure dichotomy or a consideration of the mechanics of sharing work more equitably. The meaning of time is not addressed through the more penetrating theme of 'the control and use of time' in social class terms. But as Clarke and Critcher argue, and as his study has attempted to show, leisure and sport has formed an important part in the legitimisation of a capitalist society in Britain with attempts by dominant interests to integrate subordinate groups through civilising activities. It is perhaps indicative of the lack of critical engagement of the proponents of the pluralist model in leisure studies that Veal totally ignores any mention of Clarke and Critcher's The Devil Makes Work which does not treat leisure as an obvious category of social life, but examines the hidden structures and processes that lie beneath the surface of future predictions.

The leisure futures envisaged by both Roberts and Veal are also conceived in male or uni-sex terms. The position of women in society and leisure opportunities for women are generally inadequately considered. Some brief acknowledgement is given by Veal to women's traditional roles of child-rearer and housekeeper, meaning that they are never free from work, whilst Roberts discusses gender in the context of leisure and the family (48). But Veal hardly mentions women in his text and Roberts presents the view that the patterning effects of gender and age can be grossly overstated. Overall the issue of patriarchy is ignored or glossed over. This is a crucial limitation. As Rosemary Deem points out, if leisure policy makers assume that leisure is most important to male

workers and unemployed youths, and stereotyped views are held about the most appropriate social roles for women, then the kinds of policies they construct will be likely to reflect those views (49). A consideration of leisure futures which does not give significant attention to the position of women in society is also open to the charge of reinforcing the inequalities of gender which still exist in Britain in the 1980s.

A further limitation in the pluralist perspective as advanced by Roberts and Veal is its ethnocentricity. The focus is on Western industrial society and the future of leisure is seen mainly through an examination of source material from Europe and North America. Whilst it may be the case that the bulk of texts on leisure studies has largely been produced in Western countries it is significant to note the predominantly narrow vision in global terms. The concentration on Western society's leisure futures is linked to the use of the notion of post-industrial society as a basis for examining the future. In taking issue with the post-industrial account Clarke and Critcher point out that large scale capital investment has increasingly become a trans-national process. One of the key arguments in the post-industrial thesis is the declining significance of manufacturing industry in the Western world. But as Clarke and Critcher indicate the leisure explosion in Western societies is massively supported by the 'manufacturing processes in the developing economies of the world market', particularly in South America and the Far East (50). By conceiving of leisure futures in Western society without taking sufficient account of the changing international divisions and inequalities between North and South and East and West, there is surely a gap in vision. The political issues relating to apartheid in South Africa, the launching of various schemes on aid for the third world, the focus on law and order in a European context and the *growth of multi-*

national business in leisure are important issues of the 1980s which need to be taken into account in debate on the future of leisure and sport.

The social reproduction perspective provides a vision for the future which consists essentially of a critical engagement with the contradictions of the political-economy of modern Western capitalist society. Paul Hoch in Rip Off the Big Game (1972) focused on gender and nationalism in attacking the mass spectator sports and the Olympics as the key sporting apparatus in which the dominant values of American society were transmitted. He sees the Olympics as a 'kind of nationalism-in-a-jockstrap' which promotes everything from 'Austrian ski-ware to race-nationalism, the ubiquitousness of the pep pill and the emphasis on manhood' (51). Hoch seeks a historical materialist analysis of sports which addresses the question of power in society. He argues that under the rule of monopoly capital it is not the consumer who demands the creation of the object of consumption - be it a hockey game or a president - but rather the object of consumption which demands the creation of the consumer - be he a 'fan' or a 'voter' (52). The way forward to the consumer beginning to be a creator of needs was, for Hoch, dependent on the building of a socialist society. He indicates that this would entail breaking down the distinctions between controllers, producers and consumers. He suggests that in industry and politics workers would make decisions on priorities at the point of production, electing mandated and immediately recallable delegates to the people's councils which would decide on overall social priorities. In the area of sports similar arrangements are proposed where players' control over teams and the complete breakdown of the distinction between players and fans is effected. The objective would be a reorientation from spectator to participation sports for the people concentrating on the kinds of sports in which both men and women could take part (53).

However, although Hoch provides some critical insights of how sport operates in American society with an important emphasis on sexism, nationalism, racism and the struggle between the powerful and the powerless his vision for the future has limitations. By conceiving of sport as a mirror reflection of society he both overestimates the influence of wider social forces, giving little recognition of the relative autonomy of sport, and underestimates the scope for initiating change from within it. Whilst a political-economy focus is important for understanding trends in the organisation and financing of sport it can also be a crude indicator if economic factors are too mechanistically applied. And cultural values and the realm of ideas expressed through sport can be a significant force for effecting change. He also focuses essentially on North American sport where the gap between player and spectator is more marked and the general level of mass participation is lower than in Europe. However, the shift towards greater participation rather than spectating in sport, or even the concentration on sports available to men and women would be insufficient advancements in themselves. As this study has attempted to show the objective of increasing participation can be incorporated into a liberal or neo-liberal project, whilst the issue of patriarchy will not necessarily be challenged by the development of sports in which both men and women may take part. Empowerment and control by participants of state provided forms of recreation, and real choice by consumers of privately marketed entertainment would require more fundamental changes. Despite the mass of evidence Hoch provides to indicate the power dimensions and the alienating nature of sport under monopoly capitalism, the way forward to the building of a 'humane and creative society' with 'humane and creative sports' lies largely uncharted.

Brohm in Sport - A Prison of Measured Time also embraces the future through a critical engagement with the present capitalist system. Indeed, Brohm through his series of articles and statements between 1968 and 1976 - published in book form in 1978 - was committed to a politics of culture linked with the wider ideological debates sparked off by the challenge in 1968 to the hegemony of liberal democracy. Brohm himself regarded his writing as a series of theoretical interventions in particular ideological contexts and concrete situations which 'involved taking sides in given national and international political conjunctures' (54). The sporting context for Brohm's focus was the Olympic Movement and the setting up of an Anti-Olympic Committee by the 'majority of organisations of the French far-left' to attempt to expose the games as an imperialist masquerade. Brohm argued that revolutionaries had three tasks:

- (i) to develop a critique of bourgeois ideology in the specific field of sport ... to uncover the class roots of the practice of sport and to trace the mechanisms by means of which the opiate of sport is employed in the cultural colonisation of the working class;
- (ii) to carry out anti-Olympic propaganda on the basis of the principles of proletarian internationalism;
- (iii) to develop a conception of the kind of bodily activity required for a socialist system (55)

The year 1968 might indeed be seen as a significant one for sport along with other cultural and political movements in marking a turning point between post-war expansion and the recession of the 1970s. It also represented the moment when some of the contradictions inherent in sporting capitalist society began to be articulated, at least by the Left in France and Italy. It was then that the foundations were laid for a critique of the liberal values of Western sport. Protests about race, nationalism, or commercialism have surrounded the Olympic Games

particularly from 1972 so that there is in the 1980s a greater public awareness and official sensitivity about the political nature of sport than at any previous period. However, the social reproduction perspective of sport as personified by Brohm and characterised in the anti-Olympic movement contains certain inadequacies. Although it provides a number of insights into sport and its role and function in a capitalist society it says very little about what sport in a socialist system would actually be like. In addition, whilst it expressed a revolt against authority, the state and bureaucracy, and all forms of provided and competitive sport, it was also a fairly crudely conceived revolutionary leftism linked to the French Communist Party. Stuart Hall and Martin Jacques in assessing the impact and significance of 1968 and the political and cultural developments to which it gave rise indicate that whilst its liberating strengths were profound, the response of some leftist elements was 'inflexible and unimaginative'. They argue that the student body had 'little perception of power, of strategy, of the balance of forces', that it was 'utopian', and that with little knowledge of what the working class actually was 'it frequently fell into an easy and uncritical ultra-leftism' (56). Brohm's account seems to epitomise the deterministic, assertive and economistic approach of a social reproduction perspective in which all sport is seen as a reflection of the repressiveness of capitalist society. The strategy for the future is to 'smash the bourgeois state apparatus and the form of bodily activity - the competitive relationship - in order to build a communist society' (57). However, the rigidity of approach that Brohm's model conveys would seem to be unlikely to enable popular themes of 1968 to be widened in their appeal. Furthermore, although Brohm criticises the aggression and male chauvinism of bourgeois institutions he also conveys a macho character in his militaristic language where the communist society is to be achieved by 'fighting', 'struggling' and 'smashing'. As Cynthia Cockburn (1988)

argues, a more profound re-ordering of gender relations must be involved in rethinking socialism (58).

The culturalist perspective as presented in the work of Clarke and Critcher (1985), Hall (a range of publications in the 1980s on the state, culture and Thatcherism) and Hargreaves (1986) provides both a critique of leisure, culture and sport and attempts to identify how changes may be brought about. The ideas of Antonio Gramsci have assumed an increasing importance in the culturalist perspective largely because his Prison Notebooks indicated both reasons for the strength of liberalism and capitalism, and ways in which a revolutionary movement might gain ground - even when the old structures and forces still seem firmly established in power. Clarke and Critcher, in particular, point up the flaws in the pluralist oriented theoretical assumptions of the future in their critical examination of the post-industrial society thesis (59). In essence Clarke and Critcher question the interpretation placed on economic and social change in post-industrialism in which the shift from manufacturing industry to expansion of a service sector and technological growth signals the reduction of social class. Indeed, they argue that the creation of free-time by the introduction of new technology has not been managed with any assessment of how it should be distributed and who should benefit from it. Instead, as they point out, this free time is unequally distributed by class, race, gender and region. Although significant changes may have gathered pace in recent years with increases in unemployment and the creation of new markets, particularly in leisure goods and services, Clarke and Critcher emphasise that

the speed and scale of these changes should not mislead us into thinking that everything has changed. The direction of those changes is guided by a (capitalist) social and economic logic (60).

Drawing on Krishan Kumar's analysis of industrial and post-industrial society in Prophecy and Progress (1978) they underline the continuities of social class and inequalities of power that survive. They also make some attempt to address the discontinuities that might be conceived and worked for in a possible socialist future. The central concern of Clarke and Critcher in the agenda for contemporary socialism crystallises around the political issue of time. They argue that the socialised control of time requires a recognition of personal as well as institutional power, of psychological as well as natural resources, and the freedom of individuals to control time. Indeed, they maintain that unless the politics of time is confronted socialism will perpetuate inequalities (61). In a fairly similar way Raymond Williams (1983) in Towards 2000 argues for a new kind of socialism in which the relation between work and leisure is constructed through sharing rather than competition. He insists on human concern for control over production and the distribution of work rather than a privileged minority earning and reaping the material benefits legitimised by a welfare role of providing handouts to the majority (62). What Clarke and Critcher and Williams also have in common is a critical awareness that the existing political parties - Labour as well as Conservative - function to isolate, dilute and eventually compromise 'new issues such as peace and feminism'. Clarke and Critcher, indeed, find it difficult to describe the building of a socialist movement particularly in relation to family activities, in which personal identity linked with political purpose and action is advocated, because they feel we are so far off its realisation. Williams seems more hopeful of the possibilities for change, but indicates the conditions required. He points out that

It is possible and necessary to believe that substantial changes can be made, on each of these issues (peace, ecology and feminism), in the general direction of the existing institutions. Yet by

their nature this cannot be done by any form of intellectual affiliation to them. On the contrary, the only relevant approach is one of challenge (63).

Yet the challenge of Clarke and Critcher (1985) or Fergusson and Mardle (1981) (64) is seen by feminists like Rosemary Deem to be inadequate. For despite the clear reference to gender in their analysis of leisure in capitalist society Deem argues that it still starts with the 'male as norm' premise which no amount of tinkering with gender or race alters. She maintains that unless theory incorporates factors like gender and race fully rather than including them like built-on components that understanding of the leisure experiences and constraints of disadvantaged groups will be limited (65). Deem further faults what she calls the 'Leisure and Capitalism' perspective for not seeing what actually happens to people in their leisure time as its major enterprise - drawing on Rojek (1985) (66). She suggests that it is not the case that nothing can be changed short of a major transformation in our society.

There is some point in these observations. By starting with gender as the key issue of analysis of leisure or sport the way in which inequalities are addressed will be likely to be different than if added on, even if the intentions are to include the restructuring of gender relations as an important factor in the development of socialism. And people's experiences of different forms of leisure can indeed be important as a respite from work, as pleasure and enjoyment, or as a functional means of fitness. In addition, small improvements and gains for disadvantaged groups can, it is true, still represent significant relative advances in life conditions. However, what Clarke and Critcher show in some detail is the strength and dynamism of liberal capitalism in incorporating reformist strategies. Furthermore, along with Williams, Hall and Hargreaves, Clarke and Critcher actually do give recognition to

the importance of gender and point to its increasing significance. While the feminist critique is a vital dimension of a socialist futurist politics, it is surely necessary to include it along with a range of cultural movements such as peace, ecology, health and fitness and new work in theatre, film, community writing and publishing.

In the culturalist perspective Stuart Hall, in particular combines a Gramscian analysis of the dynamic nature of capitalism with perceptive insights of how in rethinking socialism the Left can learn from strategies of the radical Right in the late 1980s (67). Hall's analysis of Thatcherism clearly underlines the political importance of constructing an ideological framework. It does this through showing how underlying economic, sociological and cultural trends have been harnessed and appropriated by the Right within an economic and political strategy which has attacked the public sector for its bureaucracy and inefficiency, and instead linked efficiency with 'competition', 'market forces', 'privatisation' and 'individualism'. The traditional Labourist Left is censured by Hall for its failure to appreciate the significance of the ideological dimension. And it is accused of allowing Thatcherism to capitalise on crisis situations through its lack of a philosophy and plan rooted in the new economic and social forces. Hall infers that what is needed is a political strategy that uses systematic ideological contestation to polarise every topic, driving home in popular consciousness the clear distinction of principle between the radical Right and radical Left. At the same time Hall emphasises the importance of simultaneously developing a more positive perspective. He suggests that Thatcher's appropriation of the meaning of choice through its connection with the 'free market' can be reconstructed through linking it with democratisation, rights and the expansion of social citizenship. He draws on the concrete example of the crisis of the National Health Service to

illustrate the possibilities of reconstructing the idea of choice in relation to such themes as the growing diversity of society, the widening of access and the empowerment of ordinary people through the right to choose. However, as Raymond Williams points out, although movements of a new kind in relation to the real issues of peace, of ecology, of relations between men and women have been rapidly developing, the economic order remains intact. As he explains,

the majority of employed people have still primarily to relate to short-range and short-term determinations ... (there is a job to be kept, a debt that has to be repaid, a family that has to be supported) Even the issues that get a widening response are marginalised as they encounter this hard social core. Moreover what is repeatedly experienced within it, and has been put there to be experienced, is a prudence, a practical and limited set of interests, an unwillingness to be further disturbed, a cautious reckoning and settling of close-up accounts. Whatever movement there may be on issues at some distance from these local and decisive relations, there is no possibility of it becoming fully effective until there are serious and detailed alternatives at these everyday points where a central consciousness is generated. Yet it is at just these points, for historically understandable reasons, that all alternative policies are weakest (68).

Sport may thus appear to be somewhat on the margin of these new social movements and of the key economic spheres and political institutions. However, what Hall in the spirit of Gramsci underlines is the importance of embracing a wide ensemble of cultural practices where political values are shaped. Indeed, extra parliamentary and non-statist forms of protest have become increasingly significant in the 1980s. As Offe also points out

The new social movements insist upon the need for additional forms of grass-roots politics that can enrich existing political institutions, process more effectively the new types of resistance to the defects of modernisation and, thereby, increase the

learning capacity of the entire social system (69).

John Hargreaves follows this thinking in his brief consideration of emancipatory potentialities in the politics of sport and the body, but he maintains that this will be dependent upon the extent to which struggles between dominant and subordinate groups in this field link up with struggles in other fields (70). However, cohesion and combination of the various strands of the Left are not seen by all students of the future of socialism to be either a likely or a desirable development. While Touraine suggests that the new movements (of gender, peace and ecology) are likely to coalesce into a single and dominant social movement, Offe doubts whether it is necessary to conceive of social movements as organisationally and ideologically integrated and unified (71). As he points out, what is novel about the new social movements is their resistance to unification even as an ultimate goal. Offe indeed favours this fragmentation and considers that 'all future political designs will be mixed and to some degree eclectic designs' in which the old and the new are combined in different forms of economic, technological and political rationality. For Offe the central theme for modern socialist politics should be oriented to the goal of negating the blind and reckless characteristics of capitalism. The alliance of forces lies in its clarity about what it opposes rather than what it favours. However, clarity of purpose and energy of challenge would surely be common requirements in the development of many kinds of relationship needed in working for a new social order. Hargreaves identifies a way forward in sport through the very forces that have moved it closer to the centre of the political stage in the 1980s. For as he points out, in this process issues have appeared in the apparently apolitical face of sport which provide scope for challenge of bourgeois hegemony by subordinate groups. Three concrete situations are cited: the way government handles the problem of the

alienated population of the inner cities, the programming of sport in the national interest and the tension with the nature of sport as an autonomous means of expression, and the growing pressure to transform sport from a male-dominated domain. Hargreaves concludes that there is no ready-made model available given that the amateur tradition, commercialised sport, social democratic 'Sport for All' and communist-block sport have all been discredited in regard to their emancipatory pretensions (72). His analysis rooted in the Gramscian tradition and culturalist perspective suggests that the critical reflection and creative thought he advocates would be in challenging the capitalist structures of sport and the crude revolutionary alternative of vulgar Marxism. However, although some indication is given by the culturalist perspective of the way analysis can be constructed in relation to the class inequalities of Western democratic society, the difficulties of conceptualising and characterising an alternative and oppositional political future are also evident. Raymond Williams summed up the magnitude and the faith of a socialist future in the statement

It is only in a shared belief and insistence that there are practical alternatives that the balance of forces and changes begins to alter. Once the inevitabilities are challenged, we begin gathering our resources for a journey of hope. If there are no easy answers there are still available and discoverable hard answers and it is these we can now learn to make and share (73).

The Place of Sport in a Prospective Socialist Enterprise

It has been argued in Chapter Four that any vision of socialism as a democratic and needs oriented political project was lost in the centralist, bureaucratic and opportunistic perspective of the Labour governments of 1964-70 and 1974-79. Whilst the top-down approach of this

period led to the establishment of a framework for a local authority based recreation profession, and the significant expansion of sports facilities, it failed to alter the balance of inequalities between social classes and in relation to gender and ethnic minorities. The main beneficiaries in sports provision appeared to be white middle-class males. It has also become apparent that the exercise of rethinking socialism in the late 1980s is at a preliminary and exploratory stage in terms of understanding how to structure the debate to move beyond the statist version of socialism. In this debate although sport may be on the periphery of the search for ways of formulating a socialist futures project, nevertheless, as a significant area of popular culture it could, with advantage to that project, be made more manifest in wider discussions by the Left.

Whannel's contribution to the series *Arguments for Socialism in Blowing the Whistle: The Politics of Sport* published in 1983 might at least be extended and reconsidered in the light of more recent analysis of the part sport might play in a prospective socialist enterprise. Questions to consider in this task include asking where might one start from in conceptualising a socialist future in relation to sport? What themes need to be developed and how might these relate to existing social movements? To what extent should the relative autonomy of sport be a constraining factor in formulating an alternative political project to the liberal and conservative domination? How can the strength of capitalism in incorporating challenges to it be overcome? What can be learned from recent attempts to develop socialist strategies in the sport and recreation area?

It would seem that a futures project for socialism needs to start from where we are in the late 1980s rather than draw on an abstract 'restatement of eternal and general aims and values'. As desirable as principles of socialism are that have been represented by Labour:

liberty, equality, community, justice and democracy, these need to be related to current concerns, values and above all the political and ideological climate of recent years (74). In sport the 1980s have been shaped by the influence of a centralist and authoritarian government, the ideological thrust of commercialism, business and sponsorship interests, and the association of popular perceptions with media images, entertainment, consumerism and an expanding link with the tourism industry. A socialist vision for the future would need to recognise where people are in their understanding and experience of sport as culture in this context. It is not a question of attempting to return to the romantic attachment to voluntary initiatives and sport as education, or to argue for the welfare state recreation programmes, for these scenarios have been shown to have limitations as far as the passage of power to the mass of recreation participants is concerned. Indeed, as Pat Devine (1988) maintains:

In order to redefine and revivify the socialist vision, to challenge the hegemony of the new Right and change the terms of the debate, we have to start from what is wrong with the statist version of socialism and develop an alternative (75).

A number of writers have addressed themselves to this question, including Poulantzas (1980), Held (1983), Offe (1984) and Hall (1984, 1985, 1988) (76). The general theme has been that statist forms of socialism have not empowered or politicised the masses. Planning on Fabian lines actually served to make people experience the state in a dependent way even though they may have come to rely on and have to some extent benefited from its services (77). Further, as Paul Willis (1983) argued, young people are attracted by the bright lights and images of commercialism (78), and Hall (1984) pointed out, that imagining socialism in twentieth century terms means recognising people's interests in the

material products of modern technology - computers, video games etc. (79). There are indeed clear contradictions in the traditional notions of what state socialism entails, which become evident in an analysis of the changes in sport since the late 1950s. The establishment of a public sector local state leisure service on welfare lines and the construction of a recreation management profession has resulted in policies for community recreation but alongside tendencies of bureaucratic rationality, and a 'managerialist emphasis on cost reduction, market orientation and income maximisation' (80). But so too the intensification of pressures towards commercialism and commodification in the delivery of leisure services might also provide an awareness that efficiency in management does not necessarily lead to effectivity in recreational provision nor the involvement of communities in the provided forms. Coalter et al (1986) ask whether leisure services should remain concerned with utilitarian rational 'recreative' provision or whether they should adapt to new forms of leisure, hedonism and consumerism (81). The answer in terms of a futurist socialist project would surely be to move on from the instrumentalism of welfare state provision but to negotiate with the business field and market in ways which expropriated popular material aspirations 'from identification with the private market and private appropriation' (Hall 1984) (82). This need not be a narrowly self interested notion of pleasure, a kind of market socialism which appears to be gathering momentum in the West as the way forward in 1988. As Pat Devine argues although the case for market socialism of some sort emphasises the importance of decentralisation, flexibility, efficiency and the desirability of choice it also tends to reflect the hegemony of the new Right. He suggests that the tendency in this political framework is for an instrumental and manipulative treatment of people rather than transforming them in the direction of becoming self-activating. His alternative is to see socialism as essentially about democratic planning

through the process of negotiated co-ordination. The organising principle and vision he puts forward is the 'active conscious involvement of people in collective decisions and activities' (83). A key issue for the Left thus appears to be what kind of socialism is to be conceived and advanced - state socialism, market socialism or democratic socialism - in engaging with the market and economic and social needs as we move towards the twenty first century.

The themes that might be promoted in a socialist future are already taking shape in the new social movements of the environment, peace and gender. However, with sport the distinctive areas which stand out in the findings of this study, and as pinpointed in the analysis made earlier in this chapter, are those of maleness and the challenge to this, nationalism and the shift to a more global perspective, and the control over leisure time. In exploiting the potential for working through these movements one would need to challenge the traditions of liberalism and conservatism at all levels to offset the strengths of capitalism to adapt and incorporate. This would entail operating within the state and civil society, at an institutional and personal plane, and from an official and unofficial position. Whilst recognising that sport contains certain traditions of autonomy and that using it as a political instrument could alienate its subordinate targets, it is also necessary to understand that maleness, nationalism and integration into dominant forms and structures have also been part of its development. Challenge to those values and practices would therefore need to be made within the institutions of sport and over the issues that arise in relation to these matters.

Sport represents a particularly important domain for the challenge to patriarchy and it is perhaps surprising that it has not already been subject to greater interrogation by the feminist movement. The targeting

of women by the Sports Council as a means of increasing opportunities for participation hardly addresses the issues since sport not only institutionalises sex differences but incorporates womens sport into the male-dominated model. Indeed, sport is symbolic of patriarchy in that it is a form of legitimated aggression which serves an important function in maintaining male hegemony. As Brohm (1978) pointed out

the fact that women are tending to practice sports hitherto restricted to men does not open up any perspective for their liberation, in that it identifies liberation with the emulation of men and hence perpetuates the patriarchal system (84).

The Greater London Council in the mid-1980s began to show a more sensitive and sophisticated approach by starting from the position of addressing women's needs rather than fitting in to the sports system itself. This was assisted in management and administration through the establishment of a 'Women's Committee' which was able to make critical comment on provision for women at sports centres. For instance, in 1983 it was pointed out by the Women's Committee that provision appeared to have concentrated upon providing for one of the traditional images of a woman, i.e. young married mothers with children. The Committee report stated

It must be realised that such a group is only a section albeit important, of the women's population. Given the need to encourage and enable all women to participate in active sports to a greater degree, the provision and marketing of opportunities will need to be more sensitive and flexible than has been the case. Management policies will need to be framed bearing in mind that women include those who are single, married, young, old, with children, without children, with dependent other relatives (85).

The G.L.C. thus gave a lead in a municipal socialist context of how provision for women in recreation needed to take into account the

diversity of situations and relationships appropriate to women. However, although this approach represented an advance on merely bringing women into the sports system it also failed to make much impression on the maleness of sports reinforced by the statist expansion and media interest in elite provision and mass participation since the 1960s. Indeed, the relation between the state, the media and sport has been a symbiotic one which has reinforced the patriarchal images.

What is required for a radical socialism is to critically address the question of what the gender structure of sport entails. As Cynthia Cockburn argues

Men are the prime movers and the dominant sex in the gender order. Masculinity emerges as its prime problem. Whatever we envisage socialism to be it has to involve a restructuring of male subjectivity, a genuine resolution of the contradictions of masculinity ... (86)

To apply this principle in sport means challenging its very structure, value system and practices in terms of gender roles. For male domination is not only deeply rooted in the Olympic movement, the amateur tradition and the education system, but maintained and reinforced in so-called 'new' sports like snooker, darts and bowls which have come to prominence through media interest, the exploitation of sport as entertainment and the rise of sponsorship. More is involved than changes in provision to allow women greater access and opportunities to sport and recreation. The basis of sport is not neutral, but infused by elements of sexism and racism. To counter this it will be necessary to develop socialist and feminist ways of organisation and resourcing of sport and of thinking about its relation to local communities, socialist and feminist ways of participation in sport, and socialist and feminist ways of communicating its messages through the media to a wider public. To achieve this would require a

greater awareness of gender within sport, but also, surely, some liaison and communication with the wider feminist movement. 'The personal is political' slogan of feminism would need to be infused into a challenge of the institutional traditions of liberalism and conservatism so embedded into sport if a more just society is to be attained in the 1990s and beyond. But in this enterprise socialist and feminist ideas need to be made popular. There are dangers of alienating potential support if the campaign is too aggressive.

The forces of liberalism, commercialism and socialism which have been interwoven into the development of sport in the past promise to continue to exert an influence in the future but on a wider basis. The national and international scale and focus of sport seems likely to increase and, in addition to gender, issues relating to nationalism are important for the socialist vision and programme for the next century. Hope for the future through world-wide co-operation using sport as a catalyst in the Olympic tradition was expressed by the former Labour Member of Parliament, Philip Noel-Baker, in 1979. He stated then that

Science has been made the prostitute of war and as a direct result every man and every woman and every child in every nation stands today before a double danger - nuclear doom with unimaginable destruction ... and world poverty and hunger ... It is a double danger, it is a double evil and the twin evils could be cured together if mankind would transfer the resources given to preparing nuclear war to preparing welfare, economic development, public health. If nations would transform the world from war and armaments and conflict to co-operation, understanding and peace, we could see a change for the better within a decade ... Of all the forces which can influence the choice which every man and statesman has now to make, of all the forces that can work for our survival, I believe international sport is now the strongest. I believe that the Games in Moscow in 1980 might be the

watershed of the annals of mankind, that we might put behind us the squalor and cruelty of the past, that we might transform the world into a glorious society of happy people where it is good to be alive (87).

But this statement whilst conveying a humanistic optimism which opposed the direction of modern industrial society, and the dangers and inequalities which have been produced, also indicated a liberal romantic idealism and blinkered perspective to the realities of the conflicting forces operating within and on contemporary sport. In the event, the Olympic Games of 1980 epitomised the political conflicts surrounding sport at international level, and highlighted the tensions between the authoritarian nature of neo-liberalism in the Thatcher Government's pressure on British sports bodies and the liberal progressivism of Olympism. Whilst Philip Noel-Baker's humanist sentiments might be a necessary part of the socialist vision in terms of its global perspective, its concern about peace and international understanding and its identification of sport as an important domain for the expression and shaping of values, they fail to identify and challenge the characteristics of liberal capitalist society itself which form the basis of international communications.

Resistance to the logic of the blind and self destructive logic of capitalism which disregards any needs or use-values external to its own purposes is of the essence of the 'new' socialism. And it is at the national and international level that this is becoming most evident through the areas of ecology, peace, democratic rights and employment/unemployment. Offe (1984) suggested that democratic socialism was indeed being transformed into eco-socialism which though being unclear about what it favoured, showed strength as an alliance of forces made up of protestors and elite defectors in opposing the 'blind evolution of processes of capitalist rationalisation' (88). However, this broader

critical perspective may be inhibited in the British political and sporting contexts through an insularity which tends to see political and sporting problems through a narrow British vision. It is argued in the Times Higher Educational Supplement (June 1988) that

In Britain, mistakenly, we imagine that our past and our present can be neatly packaged away in boxes labelled 'nation', 'culture', 'society', 'science' and so on. We have never really had to define the intellectual categories which these boxes represent or to justify the accuracy of the labels we attach to them - except perhaps as arid academic games which are despised by the philistine majority. As a result we have found it difficult to discuss some of the most important questions facing our nation and our world (89).

One of the ways of moving beyond this insularity might be to embrace more fully and systematically the potential for an eco-socialism on an international scale through a range of agencies and pursuits including sports activities. Stuart Hall (1984) identified the potential for such a politics of culture which touched popular attitudes, in seeing the connection between the widening concerns for health and exercise, and the growing consciousness about environment and ecological considerations. As Hall indicated

... they touch very popular attitudes (which) arise, in part, from an awareness that the ecological environment is as much of a social enterprise as other, more mundane aspects; that social irresponsibility arises as much in the exploitation of community health as it does in the exploitation of labour power (90).

However, as Hall also points out, although the forging of links between various elements of the Left and the labour movement on the issue of the environment is not inconceivable, particularly against the background of interest in other countries, it has tended not to happen because of the more personalised and apolitical form of the ecological impulse. In

addition, the interest in health may just as likely be incorporated into a widening commercial leisure and health industry. The task for socialism would be to turn to account these popular interests towards an emphasis on public purpose and community need.

But as Whannel points out, nationalism has always been a problem for socialist analysis, and national sport as a manifestation of nationalism also presents certain difficulties, not least, since it tends to bring out 'an artificial sense of national-belongingness' shared by all classes and by both the political Right and Left. Indeed, as Whannel states,

National sport has proved a highly successful element of bourgeois ideology. A popular cultural activity is linked to national identity, an unproblematic unity over and above political difference ... It masks social divisions and antagonisms, offering a unity which we all too easily fall in with ... We see through it yet are part of it (91).

Penetrating these entrenched attitudes poses demanding challenges to socialism. Whannel suggests ways forward, including an attack on the role of elite development in sport with an opening up of discussion on the balance of funding for grass roots and elite levels of participation, and the replacement of formalised national sport with less formal contacts between groups and teams for different countries. He calls for a continuing debate to take on board the complexities of, for example, the need to provide opportunities for young people to develop their talents in sport alongside attempts to overcome the negative aspects of national competition. A further issue that Whannel raises is the absence of a location where a dialogue between socialists interested in sport and sports people with a socialist outlook might develop (92). Is this an initiative for the Labour Party, for certain municipal authorities, for

governing bodies of sport, for groups like the Leisure Studies Association or a collection of interested individuals? This question has still to be resolved, but the answer may not lie in waiting for initiatives within sport or the traditional branches of the socialist movement. The stimulus may emerge from programmes like Sports Aid which focused on third-world problems of famine, or the spontaneous activities in fitness, and exercise for fun and healthy living, which might be taken up and used as an illustration of socialist principles for sport. These would stress involvement and participation of those who take part in sport in its democratic operation and organisation.

The third theme cited here for a socialist future programme in relation to sport is the control and use of time and the challenge to the ideological significance of 'leisure' in maintaining the power structures of capitalist society. This takes up the argument of Clarke and Critcher that

Unless the problem of work and leisure
is clearly and radically redefined, we
shall remain locked into managing the
contradictions of an alien system ...
Unless the politics of time is confronted
we shall find our *socialism* perpetuating
inequality (93).

This is a bold, assertive statement and raises the question of how far this might be the case. Indeed, can there be no progress in the socialist project without addressing the issue of 'time'? What is it about the control of time which makes it so important?

The key point of analysis and argument provided by Clarke and Critcher is that 'leisure' is highly significant in political and ideological terms and has become increasingly so in recent years. Indeed, they maintain that it has become central to capitalist economic and

cultural domination and that the emphasis on 'marketing strategies which appeal to known consumer preferences has become the dominant mode of contemporary politics'. The control of time through leisure is presented as integral to the struggle for hegemony in British society through attempts by dominant groups to repress and exclude undesirable uses of free time, replacing them with civilising activities, and through the 'taken for granted' division of social time into work and leisure - with the latter having to be earned. E.P. Thompson (1967) writing on 'Time, Work-Discipline and Industrial Capitalism' identified the purposive use of time as the legacy of puritanism which in its 'marriage of convenience with industrial capitalism was the agent for new valuations of time' (94). Certainly these civilising and improving values have been a deeply imbedded part of the amateur, voluntary and educational tradition of sport. Sport as promoted by central and local state has also served to reinforce the puritanical and civilising order essential to capitalism with an instrumentalism which helped legitimise the political consensus of the 1960s and 1970s and which is evident in policies of the radical Right for the 1990s directed at the unemployed (95).

Clarke and Critcher also highlight the point that in the 1980s the freedom of leisure time has become the freedom of consumer choice. They argue that although this emphasis on choice may appear to be extending individual freedom it actually serves the powerful ideological function of maintaining the forms and relations of capitalism. Indeed, as they point out, the freedom of consumerism is 'inimical' to socialism' since it involves an adjustment to capitalism (96). A socialist future programme would entail challenging the instrumental use of leisure and the supposed freedom of consumerism. It would require a rethinking of alternative meanings and practices of leisure and its affinity to resources and power relationships. And it would demand a redefinition of what counts as paid

employment and a more equitable distribution of work and leisure time. As E.P. Thompson reasoned

If we maintain a Puritan time-valuation, a commodity-valuation, then it is a question of how this time is put to 'use', or how it is exploited by the leisure industries. But if the purposive notation of time-use becomes less compulsive, then men (sic) might have to re-learn some of the arts of living lost in the industrial revolution: how to fill the interstices of their days with enriched, more leisurely, personal and social relations ... If men (sic) are to meet both the demands of a highly-synchronised automated industry and of greatly enlarged areas of 'free time', they must somehow combine in a new sythesis elements of the old and of the new, finding an imagery based neither upon the seasons nor upon the market but upon human occasions. Punctuality in working hours would express respect for one's fellow workmen. And unpurposive passing of time would be behaviour which the culture approved ... It can scarcely find approval among those who see the history of 'industrialisation' in seemingly-neutral but, in fact, profoundly value-loaded terms as one of increasing rationalisation in the service of economic growth (97).

Thompson here reflects a forward-looking socialist approach in the context of the 1960s. Like Clarke and Critcher he recognises the importance of a politics of time and of the deep ideological significance of the division constructed between work and leisure. He also identifies the issue of time as one of socialist conflict with and opposition to liberal ideas of 'improvement' and 'growth'. At the same time, the inherently sexist reference contained in the generic term 'men' and his almost perfunctory opposition to the market perhaps reflects a humanist socialist position more typical of the 1960s period. But what Thompson and Clarke and Critcher show is the firm connection between the liberal construction of leisure and the underlying values and structures of capitalism. Indeed, the argument that strategies for a socialist future need to address the issue of 'control of time' is well made. This present study has focused on the liberal and commercial dimensions of sport since the 1960s and also

found the policies and practices of government institutions, national organisations and governing bodies to be ingrained with puritanical and civilising values, and with market and commodity values alien to socialist principles of justice and equality. However, this is not to argue that no change can be made until a major transformation in the politics of time has been realised. Progress in overcoming inequalities can be made around a range of movements: in relation to gender and race, and in what national development stands for, as well as in defining the 'problem of work and leisure'.

There is in Clarke and Critcher a strong sense of realism about the strength of the instrumental and consumerist trends of the leisure services and industries but linked to this a certain determinism and pessimism about the future. Certainly the forces of the radical Right are in the ascendance in the latter half of the 1980s and the Thatcherist project is more clearly articulated promoted and understood than that of socialism - in sport as in other areas of civil society. State power, as Gramsci argues, ultimately rests on force. In the 1980s not only has the British state moved to more direct, overt and authoritarian forms of social control, but it has used sport to secure hegemonic control in a period of crisis. It is evident that there has been a close link between the police and leisure services departments with the aim of both involving and disciplining youth. At national and international levels, the disturbances at football grounds have been closely monitored by the Thatcher government and have become part of its focus on law and order as an ideological support for the populist authoritarian state. The political significance of the events of the Brussels (Heysel Stadium) disaster in 1985 and the clashes between English supporters and German police at the European football championships in 1988 was to encourage the direct intervention by the government. This was presented as a response

to the popular feeling from mainly professional sports representatives - aided by the media - for action by authorities. A place for societal responsibility was interpreted as a call for a strong interventionist state; the Thatcher Government used the professional and public outcry in witnessing the Brussels tragedy and the hooliganism abroad as a further strengthening of the attack not only on disorderly youth, but in emphasising the need for order and strong policing in society generally, and of curtailing resistance to the restructuring of capital relations, particularly in inner cities. In addition, sport has been employed by the Right to further the market and consumer orientation of neo-liberalism notably through the encouragement of sponsorship by successive Ministers for Sport.

In 1988 the British Sports Council is in process of being reconstructed by the Conservative Minister for Sport, Colin Moynihan, with the justification of being more capable of 'responding quickly and flexibly to changing demands' to meet the needs of 'greater participation, ever-rising expectations for facilities and the exacting requirements for specialist support' (98). At the same time legislative measures are being invoked to control the methods used by football authorities, and to bring municipally owned sports facilities under private management (99). Indeed, under the radical Right political programme for the future a purposive time-valuation and commodity-valuation are twin thrusts. The importance of sport thus promises to increase in the future for political and ideological reasons exploited mainly by neo-liberal and conservative forces. In the short and medium term the prospect for sport in socialist terms looks bleak.

However, this actually increases the importance and urgency of rethinking a socialist perspective in relation to leisure and sport. This

chapter has attempted to indicate the line of direction of the radical Right as manifested through the organisation and resourcing of sport, but also to pinpoint some possible alternative ways forward. The study as a whole has shown that the relationship between state and quasi-state bodies, business and sports bodies and their activities has been a dialectical and continually evolving one - subject to changing interests and opportunistic developments as well as to turning points of principle. The central and local state has itself been involved in formulating and facilitating particular policies for sport and recreation and in establishing conditions for their development. But at the same time, business, the media and sports bodies have helped shape the realities of sporting images, experiences and perceptions of participants and public. There is thus scope for further change and for alternative political and ideological activity and influence. But as Raymond Williams suggested, in order to challenge the stance of the inevitability of a future bound by materialism, injustice and inequality, policy-action was needed as well as a detailed restatement of problems (100).

REFERENCES AND NOTES

CHAPTER ONE INTRODUCTION

1. Parliamentary Debates (Hansard) House of Commons, 3 February 1965 Vol. 705, No. 49, Cols. 1081-1082.
2. Prime Minister, Harold Wilson records, 'After many discussions, I had reached the conclusion that sport was better located in MHLG than in DES. In addition to his (Denis Howell's) responsibilities for general sporting policy and facilities ... for professional sport and contact with the main sporting bodies, amateur and professional, his main duties were concerned mainly with the provision of facilities for young people who had left school. Most of these facilities had, directly or indirectly, to be provided by local authorities'. In, Wilson, Harold (1971) The Labour Government 1964-70 - A Personal Record, Penguin Books, p.898.
3. In 1984, of the seven Metropolitan District Councils in the West Midlands region, two (Solihull and Walsall) were Conservative-led and five Labour. (One of which - Dudley - had been Conservative for most of the period since 1974.)
4. 1973-1977, Senior Lecturer, Polytechnic of North London teaching on B.Ed. and D.M.S. (Recreation Management); 1978-1984, Principal Lecturer, West Midlands College of Higher Education - Course Leader B.A.(Hons) Leisure and Recreational Studies; 1984- Head of Recreation and Community, College of St. Mark and St. John, Plymouth.
5. See Hargreaves, John (1982) Sport, Culture and Ideology, in Hargreaves, Jennifer (Ed.) Sport, Culture and Ideology, Routledge and Kegan Paul, pp.30-34.
6. Examples of the functionalist and/or positive accounts of sport are to be found in Loy, G.W., and Kenyon, G.S. (1969) Sport Culture and Society, Macmillan, London; Dunning, E. (1971) The Sociology of Sport, Cass, London; Mangan, J.A. (ed.) (1973) Physical Education and Sport : Sociological and Cultural Perspectives, Basil Blackwell; Edwards, H. (1973) The Sociology of Sport, Dorsey Press, Illinois.
7. Hargreaves, John (1982) op.cit.
8. Roberts, K. (1978) Contemporary Society and the Growth of Leisure, Longman. See, also Roberts, K. (1977) 'Leisure and Lifestyles under Welfare Capitalism', In M.A. Smith (Ed.) Leisure and Urban Society, Leisure Studies Association.
9. Hargreaves, John (1982) op.cit.
10. In Cantelon, H. and Gruneau, R. (Ed.) (1982) Sport, Culture and the Modern State, University of Toronto.
11. In Whannel, G. (1983) Blowing the Whistle: The Politics of Sport, Pluto Press.
12. Hall, S. (1984) The Culture Gap, Marxism Today, January.
13. Roberts, K. (1978) Contemporary Society and the Growth of Leisure, Longman; and Roberts, K. (1981) Leisure, Longman 2nd ed.
14. Roberts, K. (1978) op.cit., pp.85-89.

15. Clarke, J. and Critcher, C. (1985) The Devil Makes Work - Leisure in Capitalist Britain, Macmillan, pp.40-66.
16. Roberts, K. (1981) op.cit., pp.79-80.
17. Ibid., p.86.
18. Ibid., p.125.
19. Fergusson, R. and Mardle, G. (1981) Education and the Political Economy of Leisure in Education and the State, (Eds.) Dale, R. et al., Open University Reader, E353 Course.
20. Roberts, K. (1978) op.cit., pp.157-158.
21. Ibid., p.58.
22. Hall, S. (1984) The Culture Gap, op.cit.
23. Roberts, K. (1978) op.cit., pp.166-168.
24. Williams, R. (1961) The Long Revolution, Chatto and Windus, pp.161-164.
25. Hoch, P. (1972) Rip Off the Big Game : The Exploitation of Sports by the Power Elite, Anchor Books.
26. Brohm, J.M. (1978) Sport - A Prison of Measured Time, Ink Links.
27. See Loy, J.W. and Kenyon (Eds.) (1969) Sport, Culture and Society, Macmillan.
28. Hoch, P. (1972) op.cit., p.8.
29. Ibid.
30. Ibid., p.111.
31. Ibid., p.122.
32. See Williams, R. (1977) Marxism and Literature, Oxford University Press, pp.112-113.
33. Brohm, J.M. (1978), op.cit., pp.134-137.
34. See Birmingham and the Five Ring Circus, The Observer, 12 October, 1986
35. Brohm, J.M. (1978) op.cit., p.39.
36. Cantelon, H. and Gruneau, R. (Ed.) (1982) Sport, Culture and the Modern State, University of Toronto Press.
37. Hargreaves, J. (1982) 'Sport Culture and Ideology' (Chapter Two of Sport, Culture and Ideology, Hargreaves, J. (Ed.) RKP); Hargreaves, J. (1984) 'State Intervention in Sport and Hegemony in Britain', presented at Leisure Studies Association Conference, Leisure, Politics, Planning and People, July, Sussex University; Hargreaves, J. (1985) 'From Social Democracy to Authoritarian

- Populism: State Intervention in Sport and Physical Recreation in Contemporary Britain', Leisure Studies, Vol. 4, pp.219-226;
Hargreaves, J. (1986) Sport, Power and Culture, Polity Press.
38. Hall, S. (1984) 'The Culture Gap', Marxism Today, January.
Hall, S. and Jacques, M. (1986) 'People Aid - A New Politics Sweeps the Land', Marxism Today, July.
 39. Clarke, J. and Critcher, C. (1985) The Devil Makes Work - Leisure in Capitalist Britain, Macmillan.
 40. See Hargreaves, J. (1986) op.cit., pp.220-223.
 41. See for example, Hall, S. and Jacques, M. (1983) The Politics of Thatcherism, Lawrence and Wishart.
 42. See Jessop, Bob. et al. (1984) 'Authoritarian Populism, Two Nations, and Thatcherism', New Left Review, Number 147, September/October; and Ling, Tom. (1985) 'Towards Two Nations', Viewpoint, Marxism Today, July, p.46. The response to Jessop is contained in Hall, Stuart (1985) Authoritarian Populism: A Reply to Jessop et al. New Left Review, Number 151, May/June.
 43. Clarke, J. and Critcher, C. (1985) op.cit., pp.204-205.
 44. Ibid., p.115.
 45. Anthony, D. (1980) A Strategy for British Sport, C. Hurst.
 46. McIntosh, P. and Charlton, V. (1985) The Impact of Sport for All Policy 1966-1984 - And a Way Forward, Sports Council Study 26.
 47. Anthony, D. (1980) op.cit., p.8.
 48. Whannel, G. (1983) Blowing the Whistle: The Politics of Sport, Pluto Press.
 49. Ibid., p.93.
 50. Bramham, P. (1984) 'Giddens in Goal: Reconstructing the Social Theory of Sport', in P. Bramham, et al., New Directions in Leisure Studies, Department of Applied and Community Studies, Bradford and Ilkley Community College. Bramham, P. and Henry, I.P. (1985) 'Political Ideology and Leisure Policy in the United Kingdom', Leisure Studies, 4, 1-19. Henry, I. and Bramham, P. (1986) 'Leisure, the Local State and Social Order', Leisure Studies, 5, 186-209.
 51. Coalter, F. et al. (1986) Rationale for Public Sector Investment in Leisure, Sports Council/ESRC.
 52. See Roberts, K. (1978) Contemporary Society and the Growth of Leisure, op. cit., and Parker, S. (1976) The Sociology of Leisure, Allen and Unwin. Henry and Bramham, (1986) op. cit., describe this tradition as 'focusing on how people spend their free time, the choices made in terms of active or passive recreation, and the variety of taste publics which constitute contemporary society'.

53. See Giddens, A. (1982) Profiles and Critiques in Social Theory, The Macmillan Press.
54. See Reader, D. (1979) 'A Recurring Debate: Education and Industry', in Bernbaum, G. (Ed.) Schooling in Decline, Macmillan; Williams, R. (1961) The Long Revolution, Chatto and Windus.
55. Bourdieu, P. (1978) 'Sport and Social Class', Social Science Information, Vol. XVIII, No. 6, p.821.
56. Mandell, R.D. (1976) The First Olympics, University of California Press, p.46.
57. See summary of Young, D. (1983) 'The Myth of Ancient Greek Amateur Athletics', Ares Publishers, Chicago in 'Greek Olympics Were Not Cricket', The Guardian, 11 March 1983.
58. Ibid.
59. See Recommendations of the Bikelas Committee, 1894, in Mandell, R.D. op. cit. p.89.
60. See Britain in the World of Sport - An Examination of the Factors Involved in Participation in Competitive International Sport - prepared and assembled by the Physical Education Department, University of Birmingham, 1956. Physical Education Association of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, p.66.
61. McIntosh, P. (1979) Fair Play - Ethics in Sport and Education, Heinemann.
62. See, for example, Emlyn Jones', Director-General of the Sports Council address to the Recreation Management Conference at Blackpool, April 1980; and Sport in the Community - The Next Ten Years, The Sports Council, 1982.
63. See Central Council of Physical Recreation Twenty Second Annual Report, 1957-58, Editorial.
64. Details of the background of Committee members are contained in Evans, H.J. (1974) Service to Sport, Pelham Books, p.145.
65. The Report of the Wolfenden Committee on Sport, Sport and the Community, Central Council of Physical Recreation, 1960, p.65.
66. Ibid., p.74.
67. Ibid., p.80.
68. Ibid., p.86.
69. Ibid., p.102.
70. See Movement - P.E. in the Primary Years (1972) Department of Education and Science, HMSO, p.107.
71. Houston, B., 'The Boys Who Play Too Safe for Their Own Good', The Observer, 20 March 1983, p.42.

72. Talk by D. Flanagan, Staff HMI Physical Education at Wolverhampton Teachers Centre, 8 October 1980, on 'The Core Curriculum in Physical Education' and subsequent discussion. 'Sporting bodies are keen to recruit for the higher echelons of sport ... This is part of an orchestrated attack on Physical Education'.
73. See leaflet, (1978) 'Sports Administration at International Level', Central Council of Physical Recreation.
74. General Report of the Interim Intergovernmental Committee for Physical Education and Sport, held in paris at UNESCO House, 4-13 July 1977. Item 10 of the Agenda, para 44(b).
75. International Charter of Physical Education and Sport (1975), Council of Europe.
76. Wancke, Henry (1985) Mister President, Sport and Leisure, March/April.
77. Central Council of Physical Recreation, Annual Report 1983/84, Foreward.
78. Discussions with a senior official, International Council of Sport and Physical Education, 13 July 1985.
79. See The Sports Council - A Review 1966-69, (1969) The Central Council of Physical Recreation.
80. Ibid.; Evans, H.J., op.cit.
81. See Evans, H.J., Ibid., for an account of the concerns with restructuring national administration for sport, and the Second Report from the Select Committee of the House of Lords on Sport and Leisure, 25 July 1973, for recommendations on the creation of machinery at the local level for the growth and development of facility planning. The White Paper Sport and Recreation, (1975) Cmnd 6200 Department of the Environment, emphasises organisation and co-ordination, and the improvement of 'management with a view to the committee in 1976 to consider future training in Recreation Management.
82. Hargreaves, J. (1985) 'From Social Democracy to Authoritarian Populism: State Intervention in Sport and Physical Recreation in Contemporary Britain', op.cit.
83. Rodda, John (1979) 'Take the Money and Run', The Guardian, 14 December.
84. Arlott, John (1979) 'Cricket's Momentous Changes' The Guardian, 11 December.
85. Brasher, Christopher (1979) 'Running into the Open', The Observer, 25 November.
86. Anthony, D. op.cit., p.134.
87. Weber, M. (1958) The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism. Scribner, New York.

88. See Cunningham, H. (1980) Leisure in the Industrial Revolution, Croom Helm.
89. See for example, Walvin, J. (1978) Leisure and Society 1830-1950, Longman; Dunning, E. and Sheard, K. (1979) Barbarians, Gentlemen and Players, Martin Robertson; Brohm, J.M. (1978) op. cit.
90. Inglis, F. (1977) The Name of the Game - Sport and Society, Heinemann, London.
91. Fergusson, R. and Mardle, G. (1981) 'Education and the Political Economy of Leisure' in Dale, R. et. al., (Eds.) Education and the State, Open University Reader, E353 Course.
92. Brohm, J.M. (1978) op. cit., p.176.
93. Inglis, F. (1977) op. cit., Chapter 8 on 'Sport Cash and Technology'.
94. Ibid.
95. Sloane, P.J. (1980) Sport in the Market, Hobart Paper 85, The Institute of Economic Affairs.
96. The Report of the Wolfenden Committee on Sport, (1960), para 2, p.3.
97. Gruneau, R. (1984) 'Commercialism and the Modern Olympics' in Tomlinson, A. and Whannel, G. (Eds.) Five Ring Circus - Money Power and Politics at the Olympic Games, Pluto Press.
98. Sport in the Community - The Next Ten Years, Sports Council, op. cit.
99. Ibid., p.33.
100. Ibid., p.32.
101. See for example, the Syllabuses of Physical Training issued by the Board of Education, 1904, 1909, 1919 and 1933; and UNESCO Report, McIntosh, P., 'Sport For All - Throughout the World', International Council of Sport and Physical Education, November 1980.
102. Compare the 1960 Wolfenden Report's 'humanistic' approach, with the 1975 Department of Environment's White Paper 'revisionist' position, and the 1982 Sport Council's 'Sport in the Community' 'expansionist' campaign.
103. Note the Chairman of the Sports Council's comments - Introduction to Annual Report 1980-81, The Sports Council, p.3 - '... which of us is independent? Not the Sports Council which is dependent on Government for its grant aid. Not the governing bodies of sport, most of whom are increasingly dependent on Government, through the Council, for grant aid ...'
By comparison in the 1950's, although the Central Council of Physical Recreation received government grant which it distributed to governing bodies of sport, this was on a much smaller scale.
104. I am referring here to the increase in sponsorship in sport and the concern of governing bodies to obtain favour with commerce; the Sports Council's and CCPR's encouragement of this; the bargaining of athletes for financial rewards; and, the reduction of the masses to 'passive' or 'rational' consumers of entertainment, (further details will be given in Chapter Five).

105. Interview with Sports Council official, 21 January, 1981.
106. Hansard, House of Commons, 9 July 1984, Col.744; The Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for the Environment, Mr Neil Macfarlane, stated, 'We must also encourage the expansion of the many companies that provide essential facilities equipment and services for sport. The sports industry is becoming a major growth industry ... There is undoubtedly enormous potential for the construction industry, for all-weather pitches, coaching schemes and the selling of software'; and Sports Council Annual Report 1981/82 - Introduction, p.5.
107. Sports Council Annual Report 1983/84, p.27.
108. Sport in the Community - The Next Ten Years, Sports Council, op.cit.
109. Identifying the Market, (1983) Sports Council.
110. The Sports Council Inquiry into Sponsorship (1972) estimated £2.5 million was spent on Sponsorship of Sport in 1971; The Howell Report on Sponsorship, CCPR (1983) indicated that in 1981, £50 million went on sports event sponsorship; and Derek Etherington stated in 1984 that £100 million was invested in Sports Sponsorship. ('The Current Sports Sponsorship Market Place', D. Etherington presentation notes, 1984, supplied by West Midlands Sports Council).
111. Sports Council Annual Report 1985/86, p.29.
112. See White Paper (1975), Sport and Recreation, Cmd. 6200, Department of the Environment, para 13. This states: 'The Government's concern with recreation stems basically from their recognition of its importance for the general welfare of the community ... By reducing boredom and urban frustration, participation in active recreation, contributes to the reduction of hooliganism; and The Sports Council Annual Report 1974/75, p.4, asserts, 'Sport is not only enjoyable to play or watch, it is also a sociable and socialising activity, adding an important dimension to an integrated community life. It can bridge gaps between ethnic groups and cultures; it can ameliorate certain social problems, such as juvenile delinquency'.
112. Hansard, House of Commons, 25 January 1980. Debate on Leisure, Sport and the Arts. Hector Monro, Minister for Sport stated, 'Government would give every support and encouragement to commercial investment and sponsorship in Sport and Recreation'.
Hansard, House of Commons, 9 July 1984, Col. 746, 'some important policy matters are properly handled by me and my Department'. Neil Macfarlane, Minister for Sport; P. McIntosh and V. Charlton state in, The Impact of Sport for All Policy op. cit. p.20. 'It is difficult not to conclude that in 1984 the Minister for Sport was playing a more direct part in formulating policies on sport in general and Sport For All in particular than when the campaign was launched by the Sports Council in 1972';
Sports Council Annual Report 1985/86, Introduction - Chairman's Report to the Secretary of State. The Department of Environment, 'Nobody pretends that sport can solve such problems as urban decline and unemployment, but it can do so much to enrich people's lives, to give a sense of purpose and to reduce tensions. The Council is determined to give a strong lead on this issue.'

114. 'In April 1982 the Sports Council launched its most sweeping, imaginative and expensive participation to date - Action Sport ... costing £3 million' The Sports Council Annual Report 1982-83, p.12; 'In December of 1982 the Council were given an additional £2.5M by Government to be allocated mainly for facilities in the inner city and other deprived areas.' The Sports Council Annual Report 1982-83, p.29; Secretary of State DOE, Michael Heseltine, 'made a unique offer: he would provide an additional £1 million for capital investment in new and improved sporting facilities in Merseyside provided this could be matched £ for £ with private contributions'. The Sports Council Annual Report 1982-83, p.30.
115. Hansard, House of Commons, 9 July 1984, col. 746.
116. See Gamble, A. (1983) 'Thatcherism and Conservative Politics' in Hall, S. and Jacques, M. (Eds.) . The Politics of Thatcherism, op. cit.
117. The Sports Council Report, Sport in the Community: The Next Ten Years (1982), though expressing some satisfaction in the growth of participation in the last 20 years identifies target groups where participation is low and indicates that it faces some large divisions in access to sport. It purports to be 'in the numbers game' in promoting the knowledge and practice of sport among the public, pp.28-29.
118. See for example, Hillman, M. and Whalley, A. (1977), Fair Play for All, PEP Broadsheet 571 Policy Studies Institute, London; Duffield, B., Best, J. and Collins, M.F. (Eds.), (1982), A Digest of Sports Statistics, The Sports Council; Willis, M., (1977), Recreation and Deprivation in Inner Urban Areas, HMSO London.
119. Examples include:
Talbot, M. (1979) Women and Leisure, SSRC/Sports Council;
Kew, S. (1979) Ethnic Groups and Leisure, SSRC/The Sports Council;
Hargreaves, Jennifer, (Ed.) (1982) Sport, Culture and Ideology, op. cit.; Whannel, G. (1983) Blowing The Whistle - The Politics of Sport, op. cit.
120. McIntosh, P. and Charton, V. op. cit.
121. See Bailey, P. (1979) Leisure and Class in Victorian England, Routledge and Kegan Paul; Cunningham, H. (1980) Leisure in the Industrial Revolution, Croom Helm; and Hargreaves, J. (1986) Sport, Power and Culture, op. cit.
122. Simon, B. (1965) Education and the Labour Movement 1870-1920, Lawrence and Wishart, p.133.
123. Ibid., p.282.
124. Hill, H. (1980) Freedom to Roam - The Struggle for Access to Britain's Moors and Mountains, Moorland Pub. Co., pp.62-73. Resistance was particularly evident in the Mass Trespasses at Kinder Scout and Abbey Brook organised by the Lancashire District of the Workers Sports Federation to combat prohibition from access to land in the Peak District - 24 April 1932 and 18 September 1932 respectively. Pimlott, J.A.R. (1947) The Englishman's Holiday, Harvester Press, states that in the North of England rambling was a favourite pastime of young working men, p.166.

125. See Twenty One Years of Sport - Being a History of the British Workers Sports Association - The Workers Sports Movement, 1951. This document states, 'On its formation, the Association was recognised as the official sports body of the Labour Movement ...' Presidents have included: the Rt. Hon. C. R. Attlee, the Rt. Hon. Arthur Henderson, Sir Stafford Cripps and Arthur Deakin - all Labour Party Members of Parliament.
126. The Worker Sportsman was the official organ of the British Workers Sports Federation; its first issue was produced in May 1932 and included an editorial by its President Harry Pollitt, General Secretary of the British Communist Party. Sport was seen to be of value so that 'workers can more effectively participate in all the struggles of the workers'. The Worker Sportsman, No. 1, Vol. 1, May 1932.
127. Hansard, House of Commons, Vol. CCCXX, Cols 116-17: Vol. CCCXXII, Cols 252-57 - cited in McIntosh, P. (1968) Physical Education in England Since 1800, Bell, p.244.
128. The Central Council of Recreative Physical Training benefited from State support, particularly in the War Period for its work with Youth. Its staff was enlarged from 13 in 1939 to 42 in January 1941, then to 70 by 1945; its statutory grant was increased from £17,334 in 1939/40 to £45,274 by 1945/46 - see Evans, H.J., op. cit. p.49 and p.56.
129. Clarke, J. (1978) Football Hooliganism and the Skinheads in Ingham, R. (Ed.) Football Hooliganism, Inter-Action. The tension between big business and football hooliganism is discussed by John Clarke and Ross Fergusson on Audio Cassette Tape No. JPA954H874. Open University Course, E353 Society, Education and the State, - Recorded, 14 Jan 1981.
130. Greater London Council, Sports Sub Committee. Arts and Recreation Committee. Sports Policy Objectives and Criteria/Criteria For Funding Individual Clubs. Report 3.10.83 by Director of Recreation and the Arts, Items No. 8 S/A R 38. Para 5(a) states 'Preference will be given to schemes seeking to expand facilities for use by women and ethnic minorities'; and, 'the sub committee will not consider applications for running costs except in the following circumstances:
... The organisation initiating a new activity involving one of the following groups: ethnic minorities, women, the disabled, the unemployed, over 50's ...'
131. Atkinson, C. (1983) 'Sport, Commerce and the Mass Media: An Area for Local State Intervention'. Cultural Industries and Cultural Policy in London, Conference Paper, 12 & 13 December.
132. See for example, Sport and Leisure, September/October 1983, Vol. 24, No. 4, 'City Latest' special feature, p.25.
133. Labour Party Manifesto, Birmingham District Council Elections, 1984, pp.1-2.
134. Extract from Services in Sheffield - A Guide to Policy 1983/4, Recreation and Sports, Sheffield City Council, 1983.

135. As McIntosh, P. and Charlton, P. point out in The Impact of Sport for All Policy 1966-1984 - op. cit., p.19, 'The Sports Council's grant-in-aid was weighted in favour of elitism: In 1981/2 25% of the Council's expenditure was invested in elitism through grant aid to governing bodies of sport, 10% was invested in the running of the National Sports Centres and 10% was invested in national facilities.
136. For example, the 'Merseyside Initiative' of Secretary of State, Michael Heseltine in providing additional resources for sports facilities following the 1981 Toxteth riots. Sports Council Annual Report 1981-82, p.13.
137. See Atkinson, C. (1983) op. cit.
138. Hall, S. (1984) The Culture Gap, op. cit.
139. Ibid.
140. Habermas, J. (1976) Legitimation Crisis, Heinemann.
141. See Castells, M. (1977) The Urban Question, Edward Arnold; and Castells, M. (1978) City, Class and Power, Macmillan Press Ltd.
142. Whitson, D. (1984) 'Leisure and the State: Theorising Struggles over Everyday Life' - presented at the Leisure Studies Association Conference. Leisure, Politics, Planning and People, July, Sussex University.
143. Seabrooke, J. (1982) 'Mrs Thatcher has shown that what has happened within the Left over the past 30 years was all fiction', The Guardian, 1 March.
144. Hall, S. (1984) 'The Culture Gap', op. cit.
145. Willis, P. (1983) Youth Unemployment: Thinking the Unthinkable, dated August, Conference Paper delivered at Westhill College, December 1983.
146. Whitson, D. (1984) op.cit.
147. Crouch, C. (1979) State and Economy in Contemporary Capitalism, Croom Helm, pp.19-22.
148. Winkler, J.T. (1976) 'Corporatism', European Journal of Sociology, Vol. 17, Part 1, pp.100-136.
149. Newman, O. (1981) The Challenge of Corporatism, Macmillan; and Newman, O. (1981) Corporatism, Leisure and Collective Consumption, Centre for Leisure Studies, Salford University.
150. Streeck, W. (1983) 'Between Pluralism and Corporatism: German Business Associations and the State', Journal of Public Policy, Vol. 3, Part 3, 265-84, August.
151. Hargreaves, J. (1985) From Social Democracy to Authoritarian Populism: State Intervention in Sport and Physical Recreation in Contemporary Britain, op. cit.; and Hargreaves, J. (1986) Sport, Power and Culture, op. cit.
152. Hargreaves, J. (1985) Ibid.

153. Jessop, B. (1982) The Capitalist State, Martin Robertson, pp153-191.
154. See Poulantzas, N. (1978) State, Power, Socialism, New Left Books, pp.230-231.
155. Ibid., pp.240-247.
156. See Hall, S. (1984) 'The Culture Gap,' op. cit.

CHAPTER TWO

HISTORICAL CONTEXT: 1930 - 1960

1. Bailey, P. (1978) Leisure and Class in Victorian England, Routledge and Kegan Paul.
2. Hargreaves, J. (1986) Sport, Power and Culture, Polity Press.
3. Habermas, J. (1976) Legitimation Crisis, Heinemann Educational Books - see pages 69 and 75.

For an assessment of Habermas see, Held, D. (1978) Introduction to Critical Theory: Horkheimer to Habermas, Hutchinson,

4. Claus Offe holds that the state is faced with contradictory tasks. It must sustain the process of accumulation and the private appropriation of resources; but it must also preserve belief in itself as the impartial arbiter of class interests, thereby legitimating its power. See Offe, C. (1984) Contradictions of the Welfare State, Hutchinson.
5. Evans, H.J. (1974) in Service to Sport - the story of the C.C.P.R. - 1935-1972, Pelham Books p.24 states that a combination of four factors created a favourable climate for some new initiative in the field of physical and mental culture: the progress of thought about physical education; concern about the nation's health and morale, particularly of its young people; the scourge of unemployment; and a growing recognition on the part of voluntary bodies which had hitherto worked in isolation that they needed the additional strength that could come from co-operation.
6. Branson, N. and Heinemann, M. (1973) Britain in the 1930s, Granada Pub. Co., Panther Books Ltd., p.11.
7. The Times, 21 Dec., 1932, p.13, col.6, 'A National Call - Work for and with the Workless'.
8. Recreative Physical Training Courses run by the Central Council of Recreative Physical Training included practical work in 'recreative gymnastics, boxing, athletics, games - indoor and outdoor, and swimming' (see leaflet advertising 'A Course for the Training of Men Organisers and Leaders of Recreative Physical Training' - to be held from 9 January to 17 March, 1940).

The Board of Education defined Physical Recreation as 'covering all forms of physical activity, including physical training, games, dancing, athletics, boxing, camping and rambling, cycling, fencing, rowing, swimming, etc'. (see circular 1529, 8th November, 1940).
9. The Times, 21 December, 1932, p.13, col. 6, op.cit.
10. Ibid - Reference to Broadcast address by the Prime Minister, Ramsay MacDonald on 19 November, 1932.
11. The Times, 9 July, 1932, p.10, col. 6, 'The Unemployed - Physical Training for Young Men'.
12. Board of Education, Syllabus of Physical Training for Schools, 1927.
13. Board of Education, Syllabus of Physical Training for Schools, 1933.

14. See Quotation of Stanley Baldwin's from Annual Report of the Chief Medical Officer of the Board of Education, 1926 - quoted in McIntosh, P.C., P.E. in England since 1800, op.cit., p.222.
15. The Times, 24 November, 1934 leading article 'Physical Culture'
16. See The Board of Education's 1933 Syllabus of Physical Training for Schools, p.5 Preparatory Memorandum which argued that 'We all find later in life that one of our greatest needs is an inter-relation of the functions of body and mind so that they may become in fact and experience harmonious ...'; and The Times, 24 November, 1934, op.cit.
17. Ibid.
18. Ibid.
19. Ibid.
20. See Hynes, S. (1968) The Edwardian Turn of Mind, Princeton University Press.
21. McIntosh, P.C. (1968) Physical Education in England Since 1800, London: G. Bell and Sons Ltd.
22. Hobsbawm, E. (1986) 'Labour's Prospects - Past Imperfect, Future Tense', Marxism Today, October.
23. See Cruickshank, J.A. and Stack, P. (1937) Movement in Life, London, (quoted in McIntosh, P.C., op.cit., p.234).
24. The Yorkshire Post, 9 September, 1933 'Leeds Training for Workless - Making Leaders and Life Savers' and The Yorkshire Post, July 1935. 'Physical Training for Unemployed - instructing future leaders'.. - a similar course was also held in 1934 according to the July 1935 article.
25. Ibid., The Yorkshire Post, 9 September, 1933.
26. See Evans, H.J. (1974) op.cit. The Central Council of Recreative Physical Training (C.C.R.P.T.) changed its title in 1943 to the Central Council of Physical Recreation (C.C.P.R.). See History of the Central Council of Physical Recreation - Prepared personal notes of Kay E. Evans, C.C.P.R. Senior Adviser for a talk to newly appointed representatives attending 16th December, 1965 staff conference.
27. Evans, H.J. (1974) - ibid.; and McIntosh, P.C. (1968) op.cit.
28. The Times, 12 October, 1935, p.17, col. 1 'Physical Training in Schools - The King's Message to Conference - Need for Instructors'. Lord Astor presided over the Conference organised by the Central Council of Recreative Physical Training on Friday October 11th, 1935 attended by representatives of 140 national organisations concerned with or interested in recreative physical activity. In his message the King - George V - stated that '... the importance to the nation of physical training cannot be over-estimated, and I am glad to think that representatives from national voluntary organisations are present to help your Council in their deliberations ...'
29. See Second News Leaflet of the Central Council of Recreative Physical Training, April 1936, p.7.

30. Letter from The Central Council of Recreative Physical Training to the Board of Education for Grant Application - undated, (circa 1936).
31. The C.C.R.P.T. stated in the Third News Leaflet, p.1(, '... The collation of data is naturally assisted by the composition of the Council and its close connection with the Board of Education through its liaison officer serving on the Council;

Jottings from early files by P.C. Colson, General Secretary of the C.C.R.P.T. state: '4. At the time of the announcement of the proposed formation of a Central Council , encouraging messages from Lord Halifax, President of the Board of Education, Mr. Ramsbotham, Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Education, and Lord Kennet of the Ministry of Health;

The Times, 18 June, 1935, 'The Training of Youth - Physical Health' reported:

'The Central Council of Recreative Physical Training was formed - with Royal Patronage - under the Presidency of Lord Astor, with the cordial co-operation of the Board of Education ... The organisers have been fortunate in having the support of Lord Halifax until recently President of the Board of Education; Mr. Ramsbotham, Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Education and Sir E. Hilton Young, until recently Minister of Health ...'.

32. A Second News Leaflet of the C.C.R.P.T. April, 1936, p.9. Paragraph on 'The Central Council and the British Medical Association.' 'The wide possibilities which lie before the Central Council have been fully realised, by the British Medical Association - Its Physical Education Committee report stated that "the particular method which the Committee suggests for the promotion of physical education for young persons between the ages of fourteen and eighteen is to encourage the voluntary organisations in each area to make use of the recently formed Central Council of Recreative Physical Training, as well as of the local Juvenile Organisation Committees"'.

33. Youth organisations were strongly represented on the Central Council of Recreative Physical Training including: Association for Jewish Youth; Boys Brigade; Boy Scouts Association; English Folk Dancing Society; Church Lads Brigade; Girl's Friendly Society; Girl Guides Association; Girls Guildry; Girls Life Brigade; National Association of Boys Clubs; National Association of Girls' Clubs; Young Men's Christian Association; and Young Women's Christian Association. See Lists of the Technical Advisory Committee in A Third News Leaflet of the C.C.R.P.T., op.cit., p.17.

34. Ibid., p.14, Associations from the following sports were represented on the C.C.R.P.T. in 1936/1937: Athletics, Boxing, Camping, Cricket, Cycling, Dancing, Fencing, Football (including Rugby), Gymnastics, Hockey, Lacrosse, Netball, Swimming and Wrestling.

35. Individual Members of the C.C.R.P.T. for 1936/1937 included: The Rt. Hon. Viscount Dawson of Penn, The Rt. Hon. The Earl of Derby, The Rt. Hon. Lord Hampton, The Rt. Hon. Lord Horder, and The Rt. Hon. Sir Archibald Sinclair, see A Third News Leaflet of the C.C.R.P.T., Ibid, p.16. Herbert Morrison Labour M.P. for S. Hackney was also a member of the first Council 1935/1936. However, there is little evidence to suggest that physical recreation was more than a personal interest for these members.

36. See Evans, H.J. (1974) op.cit., p.27.
37. A Third News Leaflet of the C.C.R.P.T., op.cit., p.2.
38. A Second News Leaflet of the C.C.R.P.T., op.cit, p.8.
39. Speech delivered by Stanley Baldwin, M.P. to the first Sir Alfred Fripp Lecture, University College, Gower Street on 26 February, 1932. Reported in The Times, 27 February, 1932, p.6, col. 7.
40. The Times, 7 November, 1934, p.22, col. 6. 'Health of the Nation - Sir Hilton Young on Physical Culture'.
41. A Second News Leaflet of the C.C.R.P.T. op.cit., p.8, para. 2 reveals these values in its objectives.
42. Physical Training and Recreation - Memorandum explaining the Government's proposals for the development and extension of the facilities available. Presented by the President of the Board of Education and the Secretary of State for Scotland to Parliament by Command of His Majesty, January, 1937, Cmd. 5364., para.6.
43. Ibid., para.28, p.12.
44. A Second News Leaflet of the C.C.R.P.T. - op.cit., p.10.
45. A Third Leaflet of the C.C.R.P.T. - op.cit.
46. The policy of the C.C.R.P.T. was 'to create a new demand for recreation' (see Second News Leaflet - op.cit.). It was therefore concerned to obtain resources to meet the demand it was itself creating. Jottings from notes from early files made by the General Secretary, Miss P.C. Colson indicate the concern and negotiations to increase the C.C.R.P.T.'s resources. 'In June 1936 we applied to the Board for an annual grant of £3,000 for Headquarters plus an annual grant of £22,550 for Area Headquarters, i.e. Regions. We finished up by saying that, if absolutely necessary, we could start off with a smaller sum and work on the basis of having travelling representatives. We added that further facilities might be provided in each area if we had a capital grant of £44,000.
47. Morgan, A.E. (1943) The Needs of Youth, Oxford University Press.
48. Morgan, A.E. (1943) Young Citizen, Penguin Books, p.86.
49. See Evans, H.J. (1974) op.cit., p.43. W. Mc G. Eager also refers to the critical comments of Kurt Hahn of 'The contentedly unfit Youth of today'.
50. See The Times 7 November, 1934, p.22, col.6, 'Health of the Nation - Sir Hilton Young on Physical Culture'.
51. The Times, 5 February, 1934, p.8, col.6 - addressing the Annual Conference of the British Legion in the Home Counties on Saturday 3rd February 1934, Lord Hampden pointed out that, 'the standard of physical fitness in this country was bad. We could not have a great nation if that standard was allowed to go down. It might be that in Germany and Czechoslovakia they went to the other extreme, and that the drills for youth in those countries were too drastic, but this country was undoubtedly lagging behind other nations'.

52. The Times, 9 February, 1932, p.8, cols. 1 and 2.
53. Ibid.
54. See paper, Twenty One Years of Sport - Being a History of the British Workers Sports Association - The Workers Sports Movement, 1951.
55. Ibid.
56. See Evans, H.J. (1974) op.cit., p.29.
57. Ibid., p.37.
58. The Worker Sportsman, No.2, Vol.1, June 19232, p.11. London County Council and Sunday League Football, Tom Condon, Hon. Sec. London Workers Football Council. Taking issue with the L.C.C. for having removed a large number of workers football teams from registration he argued, 'They (the L.C.C.) regard the Sabbath as holy (although when it's convenient they're not above making us work on this day). The workers must not desecrate the Lord's Day with competitive football (although they themselves may get in their high powered cars and play their golf and tennis away from the slums of London under the finest conditions with no regulations')).
59. See National Fitness Council for England and Wales, Report of the Grants Committee to the President of the Board of Education, Period ended 31 March, 1939. London: H.M.S.O., pp.6-8.
60. A Second News Leaflet of the Central Council of Recreative Physical Training, April, 1936, p.9.
61. Ibid, p.7 states: 'July 1935 saw the launching of the Central Council of Recreative Physical Training under Royal Patronage. For some years many had realised the need for a central organisation and it was fitting that it was two of the leading physical training bodies of the country - the Ling Association and the National Association of Organisers of Physical Education which took the initiative in the matter'.
62. Ibid., p.10 - Training Colleges.
63. Interview with a former senior official for P.E. London Country Council, and former senior official, Executive Committee, Central Council of Physical Recreation, 31 January, 1981.
64. A Third News Leaflet of the Central Council of Recreative Physical Training, January, 1937, p.1.
65. See Second News Leaflet of the C.C.R.P.T., op.cit., pp.2-4.
66. Ibid., p.8.
67. Evans, H.J. (1974) op.cit., p.233.
68. Oral Evidence of Phyllis Colson, General Secretary of the C.C.P.R. of the Wolfenden Committee. Minutes 30 September, 1958, Item 4.
69. Report of Negotiations with the National Advisory Council carried out by the General Purposes Committee with regard to future relations between the N.A.C. and the C.C.R.P.T. - October, 1973 to January, 1939. (C.C.R.P.T. Minute, Item 4, signed by P.C. Colson, 13 January, 1938).

70. Ibid.
71. Evans, H.J. (1974) op.cit., pp.44-46.
72. The conflict over the content of the Governments plans for physical recreation training is expressed in the dispute between the Board of Education's plans for a broader leisure focus and the C.C.R.P.T.'s 'physical' imperialism. See Letter from C.C.R.P.T., Chairman (Viscount Hampden) to Board of Education, 13 November, 1936.
73. Evans, H.J. (1974), op.cit., pp.44-47.
74. The pressure for a national approach to physical fitness and training in Britain has indeed been greatest during periods of military crisis. See extracts from McIntosh, P.C. (1968) Physical Education in England Since 1800, G. Bell and Sons Ltd., p.148.
- (a) The Boer War (1899-1902) made a particularly notable impact on physical training in schools. 'Initial defeats and the rejection of large numbers of recruits focused attention upon the physical state of the population of Britain'.
- The Board of Education responded in 1902 by:
- (i) Devising a model course of Physical Training for use in the upper departments of Public Elementary Schools.
- (ii) Encouraging schools to employ instructors trained in Army Gymnastics.
- (iii) Advising schools to refer to the Infantry Training Handbook (1902) for source material on Physical Training.
- (iv) The appointment of a former Inspector of Army Gymnastics as Inspector of Physical Training to co-ordinate the introduction of drill into schools through peripatetic instructors.
- (b) The advent of the Great War (1914-1918) brought renewed demands for military drill in elementary schools. By then, however, the Swedish System of Free standing scientific exercises had received official recognition from the Board of Education.
- (c) World War II (1939-1945), however, provided a stimulus which affected the content and method of physical education teaching. Combat training and commando training in which use was made of various kinds of obstacles prompted some organisers of local authorities to devise climbing and experimental apparatus (e.g. Bristol, Essex) which was justified as allowing children a great deal of freedom in exploration and discovery.
75. Board of Education Circular 1529, 8th November, 1940, Youth, Physical Recreation and Service, para. 1.
76. Ibid.
77. Ibid - para.3.
78. Note the statements from The Board of Education's Circular 1529, 8th November, 1940, on Youth, Physical Recreation and Service, para. 3.

'... it is essential that, if a sufficient supply of competent leaders is to be maintained, all available machinery for training should be used to the utmost...'

and, '... The Board are in consultation with the Central Council of Recreative Physical Training with a view to increasing the Council's Outdoor staff so as to expand the services which the Council can offer, and they hope that local authorities and voluntary organisations will make the fullest possible use of this means of improving and increasing their resources in trained and competent leaders';

The C.C.R.P.T.'s contacts included industrial firms. It is recorded that during one year of the war alone, the Central Council visited 1,300 factories and firms. In addition to the provision made by many firms on their own premises, thousands of workers are reported to have been stimulated to use local facilities. (Evans, H.J. - (1974) op.cit., p.51);

See also, extract from letter of H. Ramsbotham, President of the Board of Education, to Lord Hampden Chairman of the C.C.R.P.T, 19th August, 1940.

'... I also feel it of great importance that the close link which already exists between the Central Council of Recreative Physical Training and the Board should not only be maintained but considerably increased if this new movement is to succeed' (Quoted in Evans H.J., (1974) op.cit., p.53).

79. The Directorate of Physical Recreation comprised four members. In addition to Miss P.C. Colson, the others included one from the Board of Education, the Chief H.M.I. for Physical Education and the Inspector of Physical Training at the War Office.
80. Evans, H.J. (1974) - op.cit., p.54.
81. Clearly the C.C.R.P.T. benefited from the liaison with the Board of Education and received growing state support during the war period. H.J. Evans (ibid., p.8) indicates that its staff was enlarged from 13 in 1939 to 42 in January, 1941, 64 a year later and 70 by the end of the war; its statutory grant from the Board of Education was increased - £17,334 in 1930/1940 rising each year to £45,274 by 1945/1946. The Ministry of Labour and National Service gave annual grants ranging from £4,200 to £10,500 during the period 1940/1941 to 1945/1946.
82. Interview with Bernard Rothman, 21st June, 1983 - former Secretary of the British Workers Sports Federation, Manchester Region, who was gaoled for his part in the Mass Trespass at Kinder in 1932.

Rothman states, 'The Federation was not a strongly militant group involved in class struggle, but rather more an informal body concerned to offer opportunities for recreational activity to working class groups'. Rothman agreed that its aims were to obtain greater access to facilities rather than a concern with 'control' or 'content' of the form of recreation.
83. See Roberts, K. (1983) Youth and Leisure, George Allen and Unwin Ltd., p.11.
84. See Board of Education Circular 1543, 12th March, 1941, Youth Service Corps; Also Board of Education Circular 1486 27th November, 1939 on The Service of Youth to Local Education Authorities for Higher Education which states that 'The Government are determined to

prevent the recurrence during this war of the social problem which arose during the last' (para. 1), and, 'Young people must be encouraged to find through the Local Youth Committee new constructive outlets for their leisure hours and for voluntary national service' (para. 6).

85. See Board of Education document, The Youth Service After the War - A Report of the Youth Advisory Council appointed by the President of the Board of Education in 1942 to advise him on questions relating to the Youth Service in England. Although the report emphasises the exercise of freedom it also refers to the value of the club in the learning of democratic citizenship and the lessons which came from exercising and obeying authority.
86. See Board of Education Circular 1543, The Youth Service Corps - op.cit., App. I.
87. See C.C.C.S. (1981) Unpopular Education: Schooling and Social Democracy in England Since 1944, Hutchinson, particularly refers to the work of the Council for Educational Advance which, as p.55 - indicates, represented four organisations: the Trades Union Congress, The Co-operative Union Education Committee, the National Union of Teachers and the Workers Educational Association, and was the major attempt to win support for a programme from a popular audience. Its aims of providing equality of educational opportunity in order to equip children for a 'full life and democratic citizenship' fitted in with the Youth policies on recreation set out in the Board of Education's Circular 1543 - op.cit., and 'The Youth Service After the War - op.cit.
88. See McIntosh, P.C., (1968) Physical Education in England Since 1800 - op.cit., p.252.
89. Roberts, K. (1983) Youth and Leisure, George Allen and Unwin Ltd., p.16.
90. Ministry of Education Pamphlet No. 16, Citizens Growing Up - at home, in school and after, 1949.
91. Ibid., p.16.
92. Evans H.J. (1974) - op.cit., p.77.
93. Bogdanor, V. and Skidelsky, R. (Eds.) (1970) The Age of Affluence 1951 - 1964, Macmillan and Co. Ltd.
94. See Rock, P. and Cohen, S. (1970) in The Age of Affluence - Ibid.
95. See Introduction to The Age of Affluence - op.cit.
96. See George, V. and Wilding, P., (1976) Ideology and Social Welfare, R.K.P., - particularly Chapter One, 'Society, the State, Social Problems and Social Policy' for elaboration.
97. 22nd Annual Report of The Central Council of Physical Recreation 1957/1958 - see editorial.
98. See, Rock, P. and Cohen, H. (1970) 'The Teddy Boy' in The Age of Affluence op.cit.; Clarke, J. (1979) 'Capital and Culture: the post-war working class revisited', in Clarke J. et al. (Eds.) Working Class Culture, Hutchinson; and Hebdige, D. (1981) 'Towards a Cartography of Taste 1935 - 1962' in Bennett, T. et al. Popular Culture: Past and Present, Croom Helm.

99. Rock, P. and Cohen, H. (1970) - Ibid.
100. Report for King George's Jubilee Trust (1955) Citizens of Tomorrow, Odhams.
101. See Evans, H.J. (1974) - op.cit., pp.91-93 for a summary of the report of the Select Committee on Estimates for 1956-1957 of the Government's expenditure on the youth employment service and youth service.
102. Ibid., p.93.
103. The Albermarle Report on The Youth Service in England and Wales, 1960, para. 191.
104. See Corbett, A. (1968) Much to Do About Education - A critical survey of the fate of the major educational reports, Council for Educational Advance.
105. Rock, P. and Cohen, S., (1970) refer to 'the relative economic emancipation of working-class adolescents in the fifties and the establishment of a commercial market reinforcing and creating specifically adolescent desires in consumer goods and services' in The Age of Affluence, op.cit., Chapter Nine, 'The Teddy Boy'.
106. Pluto-Duschinsky, M. (1970) records, 'In 1964 total production (measured at constant prices) was 40 per cent higher than in 1951. As a result of this growth, the nation was better housed, better educated and better covered for in old age' in The Age of Affluence, op.cit., Chapter Two 'Bread and Circuses? The Conservatives in Office 1951-1964'.
107. Hall, S. and Jefferson, T. (1976) Resistance Through Rituals - Youth Sub-Cultures in Post-War Britain, Hutchinson, p.37.
108. Jefferson, T. (1976) 'Cultural Responses of the Teds', in Resistance Through Rituals - ibid., p.81.
109. Fyvel, T.R. (1963) The Insecure Offenders, Chatto and Windus, pp.120-123.
110. Carnegie College, Leeds was established in 1933 by a contribution from the Carnegie Trust; Loughborough College developed a Physical Education Teaching Training Wing in 1935. It was, therefore, not until the post-war period that the developments in these institutions began to take a major effect on physical education and sport in schools and other institutions.
111. Examples include, Walter Winterbottom's appointment as Director of Coaching to the Football Association (formerly on the staff at Carnegie College), and Geoff Dyson's appointment as National Coach to the Amateur Athletic Association (formerly on the staff at Loughborough College).
112. See Coalter, F. et al. (1986) Rationale for Public Sector Investment in Leisure. The Sports Council and Economic and Social Research Council, p.44.
113. See Loughborough College Leaflet on 'Physical Education' 5 March, 1952.

114. Carnegie Handbook - undated - estimated circa late 1930s.
115. Yorkshire Post, 16 April, 1955, 'Carnegie College is 21 Years Old - Established lead in Physical Education'.
116. Ibid.
117. Loughborough College Pamphlet on 'Physical Education' 5 March, 1952.
118. The Yorkshire Post, 16th April, 1955, op.cit.
119. Loughborough College pamphlet 5 March, 1952, op.cit.
120. Carnegie College responded to the Board of Education and National Council of Social Service in providing fitness training courses for unemployed - see Yorkshire Post 9 September, 1933 and July, 1935 op.cit.; Loughborough College provided space and supervision for 10,000 airmen during World War II 1939-1945 and 'an enormous frame building was erected for ball games' (see The Vocational Aspect of Secondary Education, 1963, Vol. 15, No.32, pp.231-246, Herbert Schofield and Loughborough College, by F.E. Foden). The Government in recognition for facilities provided for ex-service personnel (1914-1988) also provided funds for the building of sports grounds. (See The History, of Loughborough College, 1915-1952 - Past Students Association, 1957).
121. As F.E. Foden remarks, Ibid., 'Probably nothing has contributed more to the popular image of Loughborough than its prowess in sports and athletics. The main factor in this has been the creation ... of magnificent sports grounds'. Purchases of land by the Union and the County Council, and voluntary work by students in levelling and excavation contributed to this.
122. See The Physical Education Department, University of Birmingham, Britain in the World of Sport - An examination of the factors involved in participation in Competitive international sport (1956). Physical Education Association of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, p.67.
123. Ibid., pp.60-65.
124. A.D. Munrow subsequently became a member of the Wolfenden Committee on 'Sport and the Community' (1957-1960), and a member of the first Advisory Sports Council, 1965.
125. University of Birmingham, Britain in the World of Sport, P.E.A., 1956, op.cit., p.68.
126. Ibid., p.68.
127. Ibid., p.64.
128. Ibid., pp.64-65.
129. Ibid., quoted on p.12.
130. Ibid., quoted on p.58.

131. Ibid., p.57.
132. Hansard, 21 October, 1954, Vol. 531, Col. 1383 stated, 'It is the declared policy of Her Majesty's Government to encourage the development of sport and physical fitness'; but also, Hansard, 28 October, 1954, vol. 531, No.168, Col. 2272. In reply to a question from Mr. Norman Dodds (Dartford), if he would consider appointing a Minister of Physical Education, 'the Prime Minister (Mr. Winston Churchill) made it quite clear that he, too, did not have any liking for the idea of a Minister of Sport; in fact that was something impossible'.
133. The Times, June, 1957.
134. The News Chronicle, June, 1957.
135. See University of Birmingham, Britain in the World of Sport P.E.A., 1956 - op.cit., p.68.

CHAPTER THREE

POLITICAL DIMENSIONS OF SPORT: THE CENTRAL STATE
AND ITS AGENCIES

1. See Gramsci, A. (1971) Selections from the Prison Notebooks. London: Lawrence and Wishart.
2. Minutes of the Thirty-Sixth Annual General Meeting of the Central Council of Physical Recreation held on 25 April, 1977. President's Remarks. (HRH The Prince Phillip, Duke of Edinburgh President of the Council).
3. See Coalter, F. et al. (1986) Rationale for Public Sector Investment in Leisure. Sports Council/E.S.R.C. para 4.2 'The Sports Council', p.62.
4. Department of the Environment, Sport and Recreation, Cmd. 6200 August 1975, London, H.M.S.O.
5. Coalter, F. et al. (1986) Rationale for Public Sector Investment in Leisure - op.cit., p.62.
6. The urban Programme is a major Government funding initiative which is split between social, economic and environmental categories. The social category is usually the largest of the three and it includes sport, recreation, leisure and play expenditures. These leisure-related categories account for a third of the social expenditure and about 7% of the total programme's spending. By 1984/85 All Leisure Expenditure £33.6m equalled the Sports Council grant.

See Gratton, C. and Taylor, P. (1987) Leisure in Britain, Leisure Pubs (Letchworth) Ltd., pp.48-49.
7. See Pinto - Duschinsky, M. (1970) Bread and Circuses? The Conservatives in Office, 1951-1964, In Bogdanor, V. and Skidelsky, R. The Age of Affluence 1951-1964, Macmillan.
8. Ibid.
9. Ministry of Education '15 to 18' Vol.1 (1959) Report of the Central Advisory Council (England) London H.M.S.O. - Chairman, Sir Geoffrey Crowther. See particularly Conclusion, para. 694.
10. Ibid., para. 13.
11. Ibid., para. 197.
12. Ibid., para. 195.
13. Ministry of Education, The Report of the Committee appointed by the Youth Service in England and Minister of Education in November, 1958. Wales (1960) London H.M.S.O. - Chairman The Countess of Albemarle. See The World of Young People, para. 116.
14. Ibid., paras. 197-198.
15. Ibid.
16. Ibid., para. 356.
17. The Report of the Wolfenden Committee on Sport (1960) Sport and the Community, Central Council of Physical Recreation. Foreword by Stanley F. Rous, Chairman, Executive Committee.C.C.P.R.

18. Ibid., General Introduction, paras. 2 and 3.
19. Ibid., para. 3.
20. Ibid., paras. 1 and 2.
21. See Parliamentary Debates (Hansard) House of Lords, 2 March 1960 Vol. 221, No.46.
22. Ibid., Col. 655.
23. Ibid., Col. 658.
24. See The Report of the Wolfenden Committee on Sport, Sport and the Community. (1960), op.cit., para. 128.
25. Ibid., paras. 178 to 190.
26. Ibid., para. 176.
27. See Appendix II of the Wolfenden Report Written and Oral Evidence: 203 Bodies are listed as giving written or oral evidence to the Committee; 102 individuals are listed as submitting written evidence; 36 individuals are listed as giving oral evidence.
28. The Questionnaire used in collecting evidence (Appendix I of the Wolfenden Report) is confined to two sections: A is concerned with 'Questions on your particular sport'; B relates to 'Questions about Sport in General'.

Scrutiny of the Minutes of the Committee confirm that key questions on structures were confined to a few individuals and associations.
29. See Item 6 of the Wolfenden Committee - Oral Evidence presented to Miss P.C. Colson, General Secretary of the Central Council of Physical Recreation - Meeting 12th November 1959.
30. Indicated in Evans, H.J. (1974) Service to Sport - The Story of the C.C.P.R. 1935 to 1972, Pelham Books Ltd, p.151 and confirmed in Interview with H. Justin Evans on 7 May, 1979.
31. Item 4 of the Minutes of the Wolfenden Committee Meeting, 16 December, 1958.
32. See Minutes of the Meeting of the Wolfenden Committee held on 27 January, 1960 - Matters Arising.
33. Item 5 of the Minutes of the Wolfenden Committee Meeting - 28 March, 1959.
34. Item 6 of the Minutes of the Wolfenden Committee - 12 November, 1959.
35. See Item 5 of the Minutes of the Wolfenden Committee - 25 February 1960.
36. Item 3(f) of the Minutes of the Wolfenden Committee - 25 June, 1960.
37. Item 5 of the Minutes of the Wolfenden Committee - 25 February, 1960.

38. See Item 3 'Plan of Work' - Wolfenden Committee Minutes, 14 May, 1959.
39. Parliamentary Debates (Hansard), House of Lords, Vol. 221, No.46, 2 March, 1960, Col.6799.
40. Parliamentary Debates (Hansard), House of Lords, Vol.245, No.27, 20 December, 1962, Col.1252.
41. Parliamentary Debates (Hansard), House of Lords, Vol.250, No.88, 22 May, 1963, Col.388.
42. The announcement of the machinery of inter-departmental co-ordination was made to the House of Lords, 31 January, 1963 by Viscount Halisham (Lord President of the Council and Minister for Science) in his role as Minister for Sport.
43. Baroness Burton of Coventry, in particular, made strenuous efforts to raise the issue on a number of occasions in the House of Lords, with support from the Bishop of Chester and Lord Gardiner, Lord Chorley and Lord Shackleton. See Parliamentary Debates (Hansard), House of Lords, 9 May, 1962 Vol.240, No.75, Col.221; 6 November, 1962 Vol.244, No.4, Col.203; 31 January, 1963 Vol.246, No.33; 13 May, 1964 vol.258, No.75, Col.237; 9 July 1964 Vol.259, No.97, Col.1089.
- Denis Howell in Parliamentary Debates (Hansard) House of Commons, 28 April, 1961, Vol.639, No.99, Cols. 855-6 stated, 'both political parties having agreed that a Sports Council should be set up, it would be reprehensible if the Government did not agree to our proposals ... but from the speed of the Lord Chancellor it appears that the Government are trying to shuffle out of their pre-election pledges ... it is scandalous that the government should put back into sport such paltry sums compared with what they take out; and Col.859: 'I welcome the motion and warmly support the Wolfenden Report which I hope the Government will accept. If they do not accept it, many of us will return to this matter on other occasions'.
- J.P.W. Mallalieu, Parliamentary Debates (Hansard) House of Commons, 22 June, 1964, Vol.697, No.126, Col.42 stated, 'I suggest that there should be a central organisation - a sports and recreation development council - sitting perhaps in London, surveying the reports from the region ... and then making recommendations on priorities'.
44. Parliamentary Debates (Hansard) House of Lords, 22 May, 1963, Vol.250, No.88, Col.378. '... a Sports Development Council which aided the already aided, or supported the already supported could not, I think, in that form have a useful part to play' (Lord Hailsham).
45. See Parliamentary Debates (Hansard) House of Lords, 2 August 1962, Vol.243.

'Any such assistance (for overseas amateur events) would need to be fully justified by the contribution which the teams would be enabled to make as a result of it to the relations between Britain and other countries', and,

Col.405, concerning applications turned down, '... it was not felt that the political dividends which would flow from giving a grant in these cases would outweigh the cost involved'.

Quoted by Baroness Burton of Coventry in Parliamentary Debates (Hansard) House of Lords 22 May, 1963, Vol.250, No.88, Col.298.

46. See Parliamentary Debates (Hansard) House of Commons, Vol.639, No.99, Col.844.
47. Parliamentary Debates (Hansard) House of Commons, Vol.639, No.99, Cols. 849-853 and Col.858.
48. Item 4 of the Minutes of the Wolfenden Committee - 19 October, 1959.
49. See Parliamentary Debates (Hansard) House of Commons, 3 February 1965, Vol.705, No.49, Cols.1082-1083.
50. Hargreaves, J. (1986) Sport, Power and Culture, Polity Press, p.184.
51. See Parliamentary Debates (Hansard) House of Commons, 3 February, 1965, Vol.705, No.49, Cols.1082-1083.
52. See Report on Planning for Sport, October, 1968. Published for the Sports Council by the C.C.P.R., p.10.
53. See The Sports Council - A Review 1966-69. Produced for the Sports Council by the Central Council of Physical Recreation, October 1969, p.9.
54. Ibid. Introduction by the Chairman of the Sports Council, Denis Howell M.P., p.5, and General Review, p.7.
55. Coalter, F. et al. (1986) Rationale for Public Sector Investment in Leisure, p.50.
56. The Sports Council - A Review 1966-1969, op.cit., p.11, para.21.
57. Parliamentary Debates (Hansard) House of Commons, 3 February, 1965, Vol.705, No.49, Col.1082.
58. Parliamentary Debates (Hansard) House of Lords, 3 February, 1965, Vol.262, No.34, Col.1182.
59. See Sport in the Seventies - Making Good the Deficiencies: The Need for a Planned Programme of Capital Investment on Sports Facilities. The Sports Council, H.M.S.O., 1972, p.2.
60. Ibid., p.4, para.16.
61. The document The Sports Council - A Review 1966-69, op.cit., paras. 54 and 55 indicates the criteria which the Sports Council set out for Governing Bodies qualification for grant-aid.
62. Coalter, F. et al. (1986) op.cit., p.52.
63. Wilson, Harold (1971) The Labour Government 1964-1970 - A Personal Record, Weidenfeld and Nicolson and Michael Joseph, p.898.

64. Department of the Environment (1984) Recreation Management Training Committee - a Final Report, London, H.M.S.O., p.7, para. 2.11.
65. See The Sports Council - A Review 1966-69 op.cit., pp.24-39.
66. McIntosh, P. and Charlton, V. (1985) The Impact of Sport for All Policy 1966-1984 - And A Way Forward, Sports Council Study 26.
67. See Coalter, F. et al. (1986) Rationale for Public Sector Investment in Leisure, p.52 where Walter Winterbottom, Director of the Advisory Sports Council in the late 1960s, is quoted as stating, 'We were into excellence ... and coaching ... high level coaching was almost our main consideration and funding to travel abroad ... initially a lot of funds went into elitist sport'.
68. See Willis, M. (1977) Recreation and Deprivation in Inner Urban Areas, H.M.S.O.; Denis Howell, Minister for Sport, makes reference to this study stating, 'The policy of providing facilities for the benefit of the "whole community" has tended to work to the disadvantage of the deprived. Sports Centres, for example, were found to be catering mainly for the middle classes'. Parliamentary Debates (Hansard), House of Commons, 6 April, 1977, Col.1317-18.
69. See Clarke, J. and Critcher, C. (1985) The Devil Makes Works: Leisure in Capitalist Britain, Macmillan Pubs Ltd., p.135. However, analysis of 1980-81 and 1981-82 Sports Council Grants to Individual Sports, Sports Council Annual Report 1981-82 indicates that Badminton, Hockey, Gymnastics, Riding and Movement and Dance also received as much as some of the sports shown in the list cited by Clarke and Critcher. It is, nevertheless, the case that even with the Sports Council's targeting of special groups, from 1982, the achievement of 'Sport for All' is still far from a reality - see McIntosh, P. and Charlton V. (1985) op.cit.
70. Clarke, J. and Critcher, C. (1986), *Ibid.*, p.136.
71. Cockburn, C. (1977) The Local State: Management of Cities and People, Pluto Press.
72. See Coalter, F. et al. (1986) op.cit., p.53. The resentment of the more powerful governing bodies to what they saw as government interference in their affairs from the Labour supported Advisory Sports Council is given as one of the arguments in the reasons for the establishment of an executive Sports Council.
73. Notes of Meeting held Thursday 10 June, 1971 at H.M. Treasury between Mr. Eldon Griffiths M.P., Minister for Sport, and C.C.P.R. Executive Committee, p.1
74. *Ibid.*, p.2.
75. *ibid.*, p.2.
76. *Ibid.*, p.9.
77. *Ibid.*
78. See Draft Royal Charter for the Sports Council 1.11.1971 - with amendments - para. 6(3).

79. Ibid., para.3.
80. Ibid., para.12.
81. Ibid.
82. See C.C.P.R. Notes of reply to statement from the Department of the Environment - as approved by the Executive Committee on 9 July, 1971.
83. C.C.P.R. Minutes of Special Meeting of Executive Committee, 26 August, 1971, Item 1.
84. See Minutes of Executive Committee Meeting of C.C.P.R., 4 November, 1971, Item 3.
85. Evans, H.J. (1974) Service to Sport: The Story of the C.C.P.R. - 1935 to 1972. Pelham Books. The C.C.P.R. Executive had itself created a situation from which a retreat was impossible even if one had been desired.
86. Sports Council Annual Report 1972-73, p.3., and Sports Council Annual Report 1973-74, p.4.
87. Second Report from the Select Committee of the House of Lords on Sport and Leisure, 25 July, 1973. London, H.M.S.O.
88. Quoted in Outdoors, November 1972 para. 5, p.11. See McIntosh, P. and Charlton, V. (1985) The Impact of Sport for All Policy 1966-1984, Sports Council Study 26, p.13.
89. Sports Council Annual Report 1973-74, pp.4-5.
90. Ibid., p.18 refers to the recent re-organisation of local government auguring well for the further development of sport and recreation as an integral part of leisure; and p.6 refers to the Sports Council's consultation - with planners, sociologists and economists to examine the determinants of patterns of participation in sport and physical recreation.
91. Ibid., pp.6-7.
92. Hargreaves, J. (1985) From Social Democracy to Authoritarian Populism: State Intervention in Sport and Physical Recreation in Contemporary Britain, Leisure Studies 4, 291-226.
93. Coalter, F. et al. (1986) op.cit., p.59.
94. Slater, W. (1984) Sports Council: The New Approach to Grant Aid, the Ten Year Strategy and the Governing Bodies in Report of the Thirteenth National Conference of Sport and Recreation, Central Council of Physical Recreation.
95. As the Sports Council point out, (1982) Sport in the Community - The Next Ten Years, p.25, 'From a total provision of 27 Sports Centres in 1972 (and a total of some 50 Sports Halls) to 490 major and a further 280 lesser centres in 1981 can reasonably be called a minor revolution'.
96. Coalter, F. et al. (1986), op.cit., p.67.
97. Ibid.

98. Gramsci, A. (1971) Selections from the Prison Notebooks, London: Lawrence and Wishart.
99. Department of the Environment (1975) Sport and Recreation, Cmd. 6200 London, H.M.S.O., para.66.
100. Ibid., paras, 18 to 37, (Programme of Action - Organisation and Co-ordination).
101. See Hall, S. (1987) Gramsci and Us, Marxism Today, June.
102. See Torkildsen, G. (1983) Leisure and Recreation Management, E and F.N. Spon, p.15.
103. The Sports Council Annual Report, 1978-1977, p.6.
104. Talk by M. Collins, Principal Research Officer, The Sports Council, at West Midlands College on 'Sport and the Community' 26.5.1983 which indicated extra government contributions to Sport mainly for Inner City Recreation of £4 million in 1982, and £6 million in 1983.
105. The Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy: Estimates of Local Authority Expenditure on Leisure and Recreation 1983-84, indicates a figure of £915 million, and states that the annual increase in estimated net expenditure was 9.4% (as compared with 7.7% increase in prices).
106. The Sports Council, Annual Report, 1978-1979, Introduction.
107. Parliamentary Debates (Hansard) House of Commons, 25 January, 1980. Debate on 'Leisure: Sport and the Arts'.
108. The Sports Council, Annual Report, 1979-1980, p.5.
109. The Sports Council, Annual Report, 1980-1981, p.9.
110. The Sports Council, Annual Report, 1981-1982, p.5 .
111. See the Sports Council, Sport and the Community: The Next Ten Years - op.cit.
112. The Sports Council, Round About Sport, Wind of Change, Sport and Recreation, Vol.20, No.4, p.20, Autumn, 1979.
113. Macfarlane, N. (1986) Sport and Politics, Willow Books, p.103. Both Ian McCallum and James Harvie-Watt have Public School and Business Directorship backgrounds - See 'Who's Who' 1986.
114. Interview with a former senior officer of The Sports Council - 7 June 1985. See also, Sports Politics, 'Jones was forced out', The Guardian, 13 December, 1983.
115. The Sports Council, Annual Report, 1981-1982, p.5.
116. See Sport in the Community: The Next Ten Years, op.cit., p.4.
117. Ibid.
118. See Sports Council Paper, Action Sport in London and the South East, 1982; Sports Council Paper Action Sport in the West Midlands, 1982; and Rigg, M. (1986) Action Sport: Community Sports Leadership in the Inner Cities, The Sports Council.

119. The Sports Council, Annual Report, 1981-1982, p.4.
120. See The Sports Council Journal Sport and Leisure 'The Restless Cities', October/November, 1981.
121. The Sports Council, Annual Report, 1981-82, 'The Merseyside Initiative', p.13.
122. Macfarlane, N. (1986) Sport and Politics, Willow Books, p.88.
123. Ibid., p.87.
124. Wilson, Neil 'C.C.P.R. Name their Price', The Independent, 4 June, 1987.
125. Ibid., p.108.
126. Ibid., p.103.
127. Ibid. pp.75-76, Neil Macfarlane, Minister for Sport 1982-1985, states 'Regrettably that plan (the Ministers three-point plan for achieving the maximum use of existing Sports facilities in the U.K. including the dual-use of school facilities) was resisted and slowly strangled by officials in the Department of Education and Science, and I got little sympathy from Sir Keith Joseph and his junior ministers, because they said it had resource implications. It was going to be impossible to co-ordinate, the D.E.S. claimed, which sounded to me like an excuse for inactivity'.
128. Ibid., pp.22-30.
129. Coalter, F. et al. (1986) op.cit., p.69.
130. Sports Council Annual Report 1984-85, see Outline of the Corporate Plan, p.6.
131. See Central Council of Physical Recreation Annual Report 1983-84 and Annual Report 1984-85.
132. Ibid.
133. See Press Notice, Department of Employment 27 April, 1987, 109/87. 'Major Expansion of Government Initiatives for Inner Cities. Inner Cities "A Key Priority" says Kenneth Clarke'.
134. See the Conservative Manifestos - 1979, 1983 and 1987. The 1987 Manifesto (The Next Moves Forward), p.35 indicates that, 'over a third of the companies and industries which used to be owned by the state have been returned to free enterprise'.
135. Official British Olympic Association Report of the 1980 Games, 1981. Palmer, R., Sport and Politics, 1981, (unpublished paper).
136. See Great Britain and the 1980 Olympics: Victory for Olympism, p.5, James Riordan, British Olympic Attache, 1980. Paper given at Congress on Sport and International Understanding, Helsinki, July 7-18, 1982.

137. Parliamentary Report: House of Commons Report from the Foreign Affairs Committee, 1979-1980. Olympic Games, 1980. Ordered by the House of Commons to be printed, 12 March, 1980; The Guardian 6 March, 1980 'Stronger Government lead urged by Follows on Moscow Games'.
138. Riordan, J. (1982) op.cit., p.9.
139. Palmer, R. (1981) Sport and Politics, op.cit.
140. Ibid.
141. 'Go to Moscow, poll tells British athletes', The Observer, 16 March, 1980. Refers to survey carried out 13 March 1980 by National Opinion Poll: '69% believe Britain's Olympic team should go to Moscow ...'.
142. Palmer, R. (1981) Sport and Politics, op.cit.
143. See 'E.E.C. Leaders move towards Common Games Policy'. The Guardian, 6 February, 1980.
144. The Observer, 'Should our Athletes go to Moscow?'. R. Stephens and C. Legum, 16 March, 1980.
145. The Guardian, 'Nations play the Olympic power and glory game', 18 March, 1980.
146. Ibid.
147. The Guardian 'Thatcher steps up pressure on athletes', 16 April, 1980.
148. The Guardian 'British against boycott', John Samuel, Sports Guardian, 11 February, 1980.
149. The Observer, 'How Killanin's men won Olympic Slalom', Christopher Brasher, 17 February, 1980.
150. The Guardian, 'Carter challenged over Olympic boycott issue', John Rodda, Sports Politics, 19 January, 1980.
151. The Guardian, 'Ali to act as envoy', from Alex Brummer in Washington, 1 February, 1980.
152. The Guardian, 'British against boycott', 11 February, 1980.
153. See Sir Dennis Follows, comments to the House of Commons Foreign Affairs Committee, 5 March, 1980, reported in The Guardian, 'Stronger Government lead urged by Follows on Moscow Games', by Penny Charlton, 6 March, 1980.
154. See Macfarlane, N. (1986) op.cit., Chapter 6, 'Gleneagles and Beyond', p.110.
155. Ibid., p.110.
156. Ibid., p.126.

157. Ibid., pp.119-121. Reference to questions in the House of Commons 2 March, 1982 by Nicholas Winterton M.P. and Michael Foot M.P., Leader of the Labour Party, and question in the House of Commons 4 March, 1982 by Jack Straw M.P.
158. Ibid., p.255
159. Ibid.
160. Ibid.
161. Ibid., p.120.
162. Ibid., p.127.
163. See The Sports Council (1980) Sport in South Africa - Report of The Sports Council's Fact Finding Delegation, January. The report points out that, "there are broadly two major attitudes in sport. One view is represented by those sporting bodies who are prepared to work within the system in order to achieve change ... The second view is that represented by the South African Council on Sport which has adopted the slogan, 'no normal sport in an abnormal society'", p.5.
164. Macfarlane, N. (1986) op.cit., p.106.
165. Davie, Michael. 'In Praise of a Man who Mastered his Game', The Observer, 12 July, 1987.
166. Mourie, Graham 'My stand against apartheid', The Observer, 23 January, 1983.
167. Macfarlane, N. (1986) op.cit., p.122.
168. Burgess, Charles 'Why Carlisle has bowled a South African bouncer', The Guardian 26th February, 1983.
169. Frost, David, 'South African tour under scrutiny', The Guardian 29 April, 1983.
170. Speech by Denis Thatcher to the London Society of Rugby Football Referees, 6 December, 1979, quoted by Hain, P. (1982) 'The politics of sport and apartheid' in Hargreaves, Jennifer Sport Culture and Ideology, Routledge and Kegan Paul.
171. Corrigan, Peter 'Sticky Pitch for a Tich', The Observer, 21 June, 1987. Referring to Colin Moynihan's appointment as Minister for Sport he states: 'Some of his predecessors have merely served to be scapegoats for the happenings and events way beyond their responsibility - Hector Monro with the Moscow Olympics for instance and Neil Macfarlane for the Heysel Stadium tragedy'.
172. See Macfarlane, N. (1986) op.cit. Chapter 1, 'Football's Shame'.
173. Ibid., p.21.
174. Special Report on Soccer Violence 'Taming the Beast', The Observer, 2 June, 1985.

- 175. Ibid.
- 176. Reported in Macfarlane, N. (1986) op.cit., p.37.
- 177. Bose, Mihir (1982) Sport and South Africa, Marxism Today, September.

CHAPTER FOUR LOCAL STATE, SPORT AND RECREATION

- 1 Department of the Environment, (1984) Recreation Management Training Committee, (Yates) - Final Report, p.7, para 2.11.
- 2 See The Sports Council, (1969) Professional Training for Recreation Management; House of Lords Select Committee on Sport and Leisure: Second Report, (1973), H.M.S.O. para 333; White Paper, Department of the Environment, (1975) Sport and Recreation, Cmnd. 6200 H.M.S.O., para 39.
- 3 The Yates Committee set up by the Secretaries of State for the Environment and for Education and Science, in its Final Report - op.cit., paras 7.30-7.46 - indicated "There is emerging a new profession of recreation management born out of the many different existing institutes, but if its aim is to play its full part, there must be greater effort directed towards the establishment of a single professional institute for leisure managers". The Institute of Leisure and Amenity Management was actually formed on 1st January 1983 through the amalgamation of the Institute of Parks and Recreation Administration, the Institute of Municipal Entertainment, the Association of Recreation Managers, and the Institute of Recreation Management. Its approximate membership was 3,700. However, despite the creation of ILAM there are still a range and variety of associations (in Leisure, Sport and Recreation Management) vying for the same members. Torkildsen, G., (1986) Leisure and Recreation Management, 2nd Edition, E. & F. N. Spon.
- 4 See Department of the Environment News Release, 377, 28, September 1987, 'Increased Competition in the Management of Local Authority Sport and Leisure Facilities'.
- 5 See Cockburn, C. (1977) The Local State: Management of Cities and People, Pluto Press, p.12.
- 6 Ibid., p.8.
- 7 See Glyn, A. and Sutcliffe, B. (1972) British Capitalism, Workers and the Profits Squeeze, Penguin.
- 8 Benington, J. (1976) Local Government Becomes Big Business, CDP Information and Intelligence Unit.
- 9 Royal Commission on Local Government in England (1966-69) Chairman: The Rt. Hon. Lord Redcliffe-Maud, Vol. 1, Cmnd. 4040, p.13, para 36.
- 10 Ibid., p.14, para 41.
- 11 Ibid., p.11, para 30.
- 12 Cockburn, C. (1977) op.cit., p.12.
- 13 Campbell, Beatrix and Jacques, Martin (1986), 'Goodbye to the G.L.C.' Marxism Today, April.

- 14 See Williams, R. (1961) The Long Revolution, Chatto and Windus. Chapter on Britain in the 1960s; Cockburn, C. (1977) op.cit.; Hall, S. (1984) 'The State - Socialism's Old Caretaker', Marxism Today, November; and Campbell, B. and Jacques, M. (1986) op.cit.
- 15 Campbell, B. and Jacques, M. (1986) op.cit.
- 16 Lawless, P. (1979) Urban Deprivation and Government Initiative, Faber.
- 17 Cherry, G. (1982) The Politics of Town Planning, Longman, p.96 states, "Commentators today believe that Enoch Powell's 'river of blood' speech which warned against continuing immigration, provoked a political response. The Prime Minister, Harold Wilson, announced in May of that year a decision to embark on a new and expanded Urban Programme ... The Urban Programme dispensed aid to areas which showed high incidences of overcrowding, large families, immigrant concentration, children in need of care and other aspects of need."
- 18 Cockburn, C. (1977) op.cit., p.14.
- 19 Ibid., p.15.
- 20 Ibid., p.18.
- 21 Ibid., p.21.
- 22 Planning for Sport (1968) Report of a Working Party on Scales of Provision. Published for the Sports Council by the Central Council of Physical Recreation.
- 23 Ibid., p.10.
- 24 Ibid., p.14.
- 25 Ibid., p.13, para 8.
- 26 Ibid., p.15, para 13.
- 27 See Report from The Select Committee of The House of Lords (1973) on Sport and Leisure, H.M.S.O.
- 28 Ibid. See Conclusion Section for summary of these points, paras 352 to 358; see also paras 179 to 182 on 'Recreational Priority Areas'.
- 29 Communication between politicians, local authority officers and Sports Council staff is indicated in Sports Council Annual Report 1972-73, p.9, para 2.30 which states: 'Meetings of the Sports Councils with the Parliamentary Sports Committee provide opportunity for exchange of views and for the Sports Councils to give some of the vital facts about provision for sport. Discussion with representatives of local authority associations have been helpful, especially about the reorganisation of local government and the Government's policy on capital investment in sport ...'

- 29 (contd) The Sports Council Annual Report 1973-74, pp18-19 also stated:
'The recent reorganisation of local government augurs well for the further development of sport and recreation as an integral part of leisure ... it is evident that many authorities are anxious to support the policies of the regional sports councils in the planning of new recreation facilities.'
- 30 Select Committee of The House of Lords (1973) Sport and Leisure, op.cit., para 180.
- 31 Sports Council Annual Report 1974-75, p.4.
- 32 See Sports Council Annual Report 1972-73, p.8, paras 2.22 to 2.24.
- 33 For instance, Planning for Sport (1968) op.cit., p.59 drew attention to the need for skilled management and wise administration if maximum use of the newly designed facilities was to be achieved and the varying needs of users met; and The House of Lords Cobham Report Sport and Leisure (1973) paras 333-5 stated: 'To meet the demand for recreation ... specialist management will be needed ... To improve training facilities, the Committee look to two developments: the introduction of new training courses and the adaptation of existing ones ... Post graduate courses must be expanded.
- 34 See Sports Council Annual Report 1975-76, p.17.
- 35 Department of the Environment White Paper (1975), Sport and Recreation, Cmnd. 6200, H.M.S.O. See also Department of the Environment (1984) Recreation Management Training Committee, Final Report, H.M.S.O.
- 36 Torkildsen, G. (1983) Leisure and Recreation Management E. & F.N. Spon Ltd, p.28.
- 37 Interviews with local authority officials with responsibility for Recreation in the West Midlands: 31 January 1978; 22 February 1978; 7 March 1978; 8 March 1978; 14 March 1978; 21 March 1978; 27 April 1978; 10 May 1978; 15 May 1978; 17 May 1978; 21 June 1978.
- 38 Benington, J. op.cit., p.16.
- 39 Ibid.
- 40 Ibid., p.13.
- 41 County Council of West Midlands Structure Plan (Vol. 8) for the area of the former County Borough of Dudley, June 1978, p.122. Paragraph on 'Organised Sport'.
- 42 County Council of West Midlands Structure Plan (Vol. 3) for the area of the former county Borough of Birmingham, June 1978, p.63, Recreation and Leisure, para 11.2.

- 43 County Council of West Midlands Structure Plan (Vol. 4) for the area of the former County Borough of Walsall, June 1978, p.138, para 4.
- 44 County Council of West Midlands Structure Plan (Vol. 7) for the area of the former County Borough of Wolverhampton, June 1978, p.103, para 6.72.
- 45 Report of the Panel appointed by The Rt. Honourable Peter Shore, MP, on Structure Plans for Birmingham, Dudley, Walsall, Warley, West Bromwich and Wolverhampton, April 1976, p.182, para 10.11.
- 46 County Council of West Midlands Structure Plan (Vol. 4) for the area of the former County Borough of Walsall - op.cit. Recreation Section (Implementation), p.150.
- 47 Key documents produced by the Sports Council were Planning for Sport (1968) op.cit. Provision for Sport, Vol. I (1973) Department of Environment, and Provision for Sport, Vol. II, Sports Council. Among the major tasks given to the Sports Council when it was established was that of undertaking surveys and assessing "objectively" the country's needs in sports and recreational facilities. Though it was recognised that requirements needed to be assessed in the light of local needs and traditions, these were attempts to determine specialist and community needs based on the standards of particular sports.
- 48 Structure Plans for West Midlands Boroughs - Reports of the Panel, April 1976, op.cit., p.180, para 10.60.
- 49 Ibid., p.175, para 10.37.
- 50 County Council of West Midlands Structure Plan (Vol. 4) for Walsall - op.cit., p.150. Walsall's plan makes particular reference to the very young and elderly as disadvantaged groups.
- 51 Munn, J.M. (1974) The Community Centre, The Times Educational Supplement, 4 January.
- 52 See the retrospective view of recreation management in the 1970s taken by the Yates Committee in Department of the Environment (1984) Recreation Management Training, op.cit., p.7, para 2.13.
- 53 See Interim Report of the Yates Committee, July 1978, p.13, para 3.45 to 3.46.
- 54 Interview with West Midlands Local Authority Official, March 1978
- 55 Ibid.
- 56 Torkildsen, G. (1983) op.cit., p.31.
- 57 Department of the Environment (1984) Recreation Management Training Committee Final Report, op.cit., p.16.

58 This conclusion is based on the following sources:

Birmingham

Interview with City Councillor, 26 June 1984 who stated, "There is a great interest among councillors in leisure. They see it as part of a decentralisation programme, as a fast growing industry ... There is a lot of power on the committee in terms of councillors high in the hierarchy of the Labour Party (Birmingham)."

Interview with two Borough Officials, Recreation and Community Services Department, 15 June 1984, who indicated that, "... with an incoming Labour majority (May 1983) there was a shift towards community recreation rather than cost effectiveness."

Labour Party Manifesto, It's Your City - Fight For It, Birmingham District Council Elections, 1984.

City of Birmingham Report and Accounts 1982-83.

Dudley

Joint Interview with Council member of Leisure and Recreation Services Committee, and Council Officer, 1 June 1984. At this time it was stated that policy on recreation was undergoing a shift in emphasis following a change of political control to Labour after eight years of Conservative power. Interview 24 July 1984 with employee of the Leisure and Recreation Services Department who was also a member of the Local Sports Council.

Wolverhampton

Interview with Local Authority Officer Physical Education/ Recreation, 11 June 1984. Interview with Local Authority Councillor and member of the Leisure Services Committee, 19 June 1984,. Interview with member of Local Sports Council who was also a Local Authority employee, 26 July 1984.

Coventry

Interview with Officer of Leisure Services Department, 5 July, 1984. Interview with Councillor and Member of the Leisure Services Committee, 13 July 1984. Interview with Member of Coventry Local Sports Council, 25 July 1984.

Sandwell

Interview with Local Authority Officer of the Recreation and Amenities Department, 30 May 1984. Interview with employee of the Recreation and Amenities Department who was also a member of the Sandwell Local Sports Council, 23 July 1984.

Walsall

Interview with Officer of the Recreation and Amenities Department, 26 June 1984. Interview with Local Authority employee of the Recreation and Amenities Department who was also a member of the Local Sports Council, 25 July 1984.

Solihull

Interview with Local Authority Officer in the Department of Technical Services, 30 July 1984. Interview with member of Local Sports Council, 31 July 1984.

59 Department of Employment Press Notice Inner Cities and the 'People' Philosophy. Full text of Lord Young's speech given as 'The Barnett Lecture' at Toynbee Hall, 12 March 1986.

60 See Sports Council Annual Report 1984-85, p.16, which states: "The Sports Council set up Action Sport in 1982, at a cost of £1 million a year, to test the theory that the input of field

staff working at 'street level' could make a substantial contribution in raising the level of participation in inner city areas." The Sports Council Annual Report 1985-86, p.7, also indicated that, 'Action Sport has demonstrated the particular value of sports leadership in the inner cities ... the approach which survives is that outreach workers or leaders, given the appropriate support and focus, can provide substantial opportunities for participation in sport and leisure activities for those who are disadvantaged.'

- 61 See Willis, P. (1983) 'Youth Unemployment: Thinking the Unthinkable' August, unpublished; and Willis, P. (1985) The Social Condition of Young People in Wolverhampton in 1984, Wolverhampton Borough Council.
- 62 See Ward, Michael (1983) 'Labour's Capital Gains: The G.L.C. Experience', Marxism Today December; and Minutes of the Greater London Council Sports Sub-Committee, Arts and Recreation Committee Report, 3 October 1983 by Director of Recreation and the Arts which indicated that "... preference will be given to schemes seeking to expand facilities for use by women and ethnic minorities. See also Greater London Council Women's Committee Report, 7 February 1983, on study of Sports and Recreation Centres: Women's Aspects. This included in its recommendations that 'management policies and practices to attract low participant groups be commended to the London boroughs and appropriate voluntary organisations ...'
- 63 Rowntree, B. Seebohm (1921) The Human Factor in Business, Longman's, Green and Co., London.
- 64 See Fletcher, C. and Thompson, N. (1980) Issues in Community Education, The Falmer Press, Chs 1 and 4.
- 65 Department of Education and Science and Ministry of Housing and Local Government (1964) Joint Circular 11/64 - Provision of Facilities for Sport, D.E.S. London.
- 66 Department of Education and Science (1970), Circular 2/70 The Chance to Share.
- 67 Select Committee of the House of Lords (1973) Cobham Report, op.cit.
- 68 Department of Environment White Paper (1975) Sport and Recreation Cmd. 6200, H.M.S.O. London.
- 69 Towards A Wider Use. A Report by a Working Party of A.C.C., A.D.C. and A.M.A. members (March 1976), London.
- 70 See for example The Sports Council (1972) Sport in the Seventies Making Good the Deficiencies, p.10.

The Sports Council Annual Report 1972-1973, p.8, paras 2.17 to 2.19.

South Western Sports Council (November 1975) Dual Provision, Crewkerne.

Eastern Sports Council (September 1976) Joint Provision of Sports Facilities, Bedford.

C.C.P.R., Working for Everyone's Benefit, 1984.

- 71 See particularly, Denis Howell in C.C.P.R. (1968) Planning for Sport; and Neil Macfarlane (1986) Sport and Politics - A World Divided, Willow Books, Ch. 3.
- 72 See Planning for Sport (1968) op.cit., pp9-10.
- 73 Department of the Environment (1975) Sport and Recreation, Cmnd. 6200, para 57, pp16-17.
- 74 Coopers and Lybrand Associates (1981) Sharing Does Work - Economic and social benefits and costs of direct and joint Sports provision, Sports Council Study 21.
- 75 Ibid., para 151(b), p.24.
- 76 Munn, James (1986) Future Trends in Leisure and Recreation, The British Journal of Physical Education, Vol. 17, No. 3, May/June.
- 77 Ibid.
- 78 For example, The Guardian, 28 November 1986, stated that, "The Minister for Sport, Richard Tracey, recently described Birmingham's political structure and strategy for sport, involving Recreation and Community Services using school facilities as a matter of business co-operation and right, as the most enlightening development in Britain. It was a breath of fresh air in the whole pained, confused debate on whether schools have become the killing field of British sport. Amid anecdote and myth, he said, here was genuine accomplishment ... Not least of Birmingham's feats is a seemingly apolitical enterprise in a Labour Council."
- 79 Clarke, J. and Critcher, C. (1985) The Devil Makes Work, Macmillan, pp197-198.
- 80 Munn, J.M. (1986) op.cit.
- 81 West Midlands Council for Sport and Recreation Regional Recreational Strategy, Report 1: Recreation for the 1980s Identifying the Issues - A Consultation Document, November 1979.
- 82 Section 53 of The Education Act 1944 placed a specific duty upon all Local Education Authorities to provide adequate facilities for recreation and physical training, replacing the permissive Clause 8b of the 1921 Act. Powers for provision of facilities for post-school sport and physical recreation remained permissive.

- 83 See Bernbaum, G. (Ed.) (1979) Schooling in Decline, London, Macmillan.
- 84 Reeder, D. (1979) 'A Recurring Debate: Education and Industry' in Bernbaum, G., Ibid.
- 85 Clarke, J. and Critcher, C. (1985) op.cit., pp94-95.
- 86 Munn, J. (1974) 'The Community Centre', The Times Educational Supplement, 4 January.
- 87 Macfarlane, N. (1986) Sport and Politics - A World Divided Willow Books, pp73-82.
- 88 The White Paper, Cmnd. 6200, Department of the Environment (1975) Sport Recreation, para 13, p.3 states:
"By reducing boredom and urban frustration, participation in active recreation contributes to the reduction of hooliganism and delinquency among young people. Equally success in international sport has great value for the community not only in terms of raising morale but also by inspiring young people to take an active part in sport."
- 89 Second Report from the Select Committee of the House of Lords (1973) on Sport and Leisure, op.cit., paras 98 and 303.
- 90 Ibid., para 305.
- 91 Ibid., para 313.
- 92 Ibid., paras 313 and 317.
- 93 Ibid., para 314.
- 94 Department of the Environment (1975) White Paper, Sport and Recreation.
- 95 op.cit., The Sports Council Annual Report 1973-74, p.16.
- 96 See Comments by the Central Council of Physical Recreation on The House of Lords Select Committee Report on Sport and Leisure, November 1973.
- 97 Sports Council Annual Report 1976-77, pp3-4.
- 98 Hargreaves, J. (1985) From Social Democracy to Authoritarian Populism: State Intervention in Sport and Physical Recreation in Contemporary Britain, Leisure Studies, 4, 219-226.
- 99 See Society of Education Officers (Midlands) Working Party's comments 18 September 1975 on the White Paper on Sport and Recreation. This stated that the two Reports of the House of Lords Select Committee (Sport and Leisure) 1973 left much to be desired. Some of the failings were held to be "due to the lack of consultation with certain interested parties, in particular Education which was very inadequately represented among the

witnesses. There does not appear to have been any further formal consultation before publication of the White Paper (Sport and Recreation 1973) and although Education voices have succeeded in making themselves heard at an unofficial level, the lack of formal consultation must be regretted".

See also Society of Education Officers submission of evidence to the Recreation Management Training (Yates) Committee, 4 October 1978.

- 100 It was significant that the Chief Education Officer, R.D. Nixon, served on the West Midlands Regional Sports Council. Information on Walsall's Community Schools scheme was obtained in the author's unpublished Recreation Research Project (West Midlands College of Higher Education) on Walsall Community Schools - with B. Fairclough, 1981.
- 102 Interview with Wolverhampton Borough Council Official, 17 May 1978.
- 103 Macfarlane, N. (1986) Sport and Politics op.cit., pp75-76. The Minister for Sport, Neil Macfarlane, stated: "I outlined ... a three point plan for achieving the maximum use of existing sports facilities in the United Kingdom, including the dual use of school facilities ... Regrettably that plan was resisted and slowly strangled by officials in the Department of Education and Science, and I got little sympathy from Sir Keith Joseph and his junior ministers, because they said it had resource implications. It was going to be impossible to co-ordinate, the DES claimed, which sounded to me like an excuse for inactivity."
- 104 The Debate on 'School Sport' in the 1980s can be followed in the following articles and documents: Lawson, P. Vanishing Breed, Times Education Supplement, 12 January 1980; CCPR Annual Report 1984-85, p.5; Secondary School Heads Association Enquiry, The Provision of Physical Education in Secondary Schools, 1987; 'HeadBans Egg and Spoon Race', The Times, 11 July 1986; 'Pupils Losing Out at Sport', The Times, 4 July 1986; 'ILEA Sports Challenge to Baker', The Times, 10 July 1986; 'MPs Seek Law to Preserve School Sports', The Times, 14 October 1986; Richard Lindley, 'Passing the Fitness Test?' The Listener, 12 March 1987; 'Sport Education in Schools', The British Journal and Physical Education, November/December 1986.
- 105 Midgley, Simon, 'ILEA Urged to Establish Fitness Levels for All Pupils', The Independent, 12 January 1988.
- 106 Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies (1981) Unpopular Education, Hutchinson, p.173.
- 107 Hall, S. (1984) 'The Culture Gap', op.cit.
- 108 See Proceedings of the Conference of Local Authority Associations (Assoc. of County Councils Assoc. of District Councils, Assoc. of District Councils and Assoc. of Metropolitan Authorities) 'Local Government 79' - Scarborough, 20-21 September 1979.

- 109 Minutes of the Sixth Annual Meeting of the Association of District Councils held at the Spa, Scarborough on 18 September 1979. Address by the Chairman, Councillor Ian McCallum, p.7.
- 110 Association of District Councils Minutes of 18 July 1979 include the Sport and Leisure Committee Minutes of 10 October 1979. Item 13 states, 'The Committee was informed that the White Paper Cmd. 7634 contained proposals for the relaxation of almost 300 controls and in the leisure field these included controls in respect of Libraries and Museums, Commons, Allotments, Public Paths and Rights of Way.' Item 14 states, "The Committee was informed that the Secretary of State for the Environment had announced on 17 September the abolition of 57 Quasi Autonomous Non-Governmental Organisations out of the 119 for which his Department was responsible, among which was the Inland Waterways Amenity Advisory Council."
- 111 Hansard Parliamentary Debates (House of Commons) 25 January 1980 on 'Leisure: Sport and the Arts'. Hector Monro, Minister for Sport, stated:
"The Government had found it necessary to limit public investment in Sport and the Arts. Economic growth came first and support will depend on this ... Government would give every support and encouragement to commercial investment and sponsorship in Sport and Recreation."
- 112 Macfarlane, N. (1986) op.cit., pp82 and 103.
- 113 Assoc. Cty. Councils, Assoc. Dist. Councils, Assoc. Met. Authorities Conference 20-21 September op.cit. 'Central-Local Relationships'. Address by the Rt. Hon. Gordon Oakes, P.C., M.P.
- 114 Coopers and Lybrand Report, Delivery of Environmental Services, (1981).
- 115 See Coalter, F. et al. (1986) Rationale for Public Sector Investment in Leisure Sports Council/Economic and Social Research Council. Case studies of three local authorities confirm that the majority of the officers and politicians were against the establishment of leisure services as a mandatory function - though for different ideological reasons.
- 116 I. Gill, Chief Executive of Thanet Borough Council, addressed delegates of a Council for National Academic Awards Conference at Loughborough, 28 September 1983.
- 117 Discussion with Council Official, Waverley, Surrey, 29 September 1983.
- 118 D.E.S. Statutory Instrument 909, 1981.
- 119 Land Act, 1981.

- 120 See, Sunday Telegraph, 'The Disappearing Sports Grounds' 7 November 1982; Sunday Telegraph, 'The Disappearing Sports Grounds' 14 November 1982; The Guardian, 'Please Keep Off the Grass,' 9 August 1983; The Sunday Times, 'Threat to Play' (Leader Article) 21 August 1983; The Sunday Times, 'Time For Stand on Playing Fields,' 4 September 1983.
- Meeting and discussion with Officer of the Central Council of Physical Recreation, 8 November 1983.
- 121 See K. Russell, Sunday Telegraph, 'The Disappearing Sports Grounds,' 7 November 1982.
- 122 Ibid.
- 123 Ibid.
- 124 The Guardian, 'Please Keep Off The Grass,' 9 August 1983: 'Local Authorities tempted to sell off school playing fields for more lucrative building development are running into some stiff opposition'.
- 125 See also the Olympic Games, 1980 'Boycott Issues' - discussed in Chapter One.
- 126 The Sunday Times, 'Time For Stand on Playing Fields,' 4 September 1983.
- 127 The Guardian, 'Please Keep Off The Grass,' 9 August 1983, op.cit.
- 128 The Sunday Telegraph, 'The Disappearing Sports Grounds', 7 November 1982.
129. Ibid.
- 130 Greater London Council, Report by Director of Recreation and the Arts, Prog. Ref. A23, 3 October 1983.
- 131 See Atkinson, C. (1983) Sport, Commerce and the Mass Media - An Area for Local State Intervention? G.L.C. Conference on Cultural Industries and Cultural Policy in London, 12-13 December.
- 132 Ibid., Dr. Carl Atkinson was a G.L.C. Officer with responsibility for the Arts and Recreation Policy Group linking between the Council and outside bodies. The December 1983 Conference organised jointly by Arts and Recreation/Industry and Employment was addressing general issues: training for people, small groups, distribution of exhibition networks - the whole problem of marketing opportunities and facilities.
- 133 The Report of the Wolfenden Committee on Sport (1960) Sport and the Community, C.C.P.R.
- 134 See McIntosh, P. and Charlton, V. (1985) The Impact of Sport For All Policy 1966-1984 - and a Way Forward, Sports Council Study, 26; and Sports Council Annual Report 1972-73, p.3.

- 135 Sports Council Annual Report, 1978-79.
- 136 The Sports Council (1982) Sport in the Community - The Next Ten Years.
- 137 Burton, R.C. in Department of the Environment (1977) Leisure and the Quality of Life: A Report on Four Local Experiments, H.M.S.O. . London.
- 138 Hargreaves, J. (1986) Sport, Power and Politics, Polity Press, pp187-191.
- 139 See The Sports Council (1982) Sport in the Community: The Next Ten Years.
- 140 Hall, Stuart (1987) 'Blue Election, Election Blues', Marxism Today, July.
- 141 Sports Council Annual Reports for 1985-86 and 1986-87 refer to 'safety standards'; 'firm measures taken by the government, individual clubs, the police, local authorities, the Football Trust and others' in relation to football hooliganism, crowd control and safety at sports grounds; 'monitoring and assessment of performance'; 'tight and effective financial control'; 'standards of management'; 'disciplinary action by governing bodies' to fight the abuse of drugs in sport.
- 142 See White Paper (1975) Sport and Recreation op.cit., and Macfarlane, N. (1986) op.cit., Chs. 1 and 2.
- 143 Lawless, P. (1979), op.cit.
- 144 Interview with Solihull Borough Council Official, 30 July 1984.
- 145 A series of interviews with Headmasters, Community Directors and staff of two Walsall Community Schools during 1981.
- 146 Interview with Sandwell Metropolitan Borough Senior Official, 30 May 1984; and interview with Junior Official, 23 July 1984.
- 147 Interview with two City of Birmingham Senior Officials, 15 June 1984. Interview with City of Birmingham Councillor, Member of Leisure Services Committee, 26 June 1984.
- 148 Department of Employment Press Notice, Inner Cities and the 'People' Philosophy, 12 March 1986.
- 149 Hall, S. (1987) Blue Election, Election Blues, Marxism Today, July.
- 150 Hargreaves, J. (1986) Sport, Power and Culture op.cit., p.191.
- 151 Ibid., p.221.
- 152 Hansard, House of Commons, 6 April 1977, cols. 1323-4.

- 153 West Yorkshire Metropolitan Police (1977) Violence and Vandalism at Football Matches and Public Gatherings in West Yorkshire, unpublished.
- 154 See The Sports Council (1982) Sport in the Community - The Next Ten Years, p.18 Reference to family groups being deterred from attending soccer matches because of outbreaks of violence among young fans, and p.36 Reference to targeting on parents with young children.
Sports Council Annual Reports for 1982-3, 1983-4, 1984-5, 1985-6, and 1986-7; all have sections on Sports Leadership in Inner Cities, and Community Leadership in the context of Unemployment.
- 155 Macfarlane, N. (1986) op.cit., p.15 and pp108-9.
- 156 The Sports Council Annual Report, 1981-82, p.13 states:
'In the Spring of 1981, the country was shocked by the riots in Brixton, Toxteth, Moss Side and other inner city areas. An Inquiry, led by Lord Scarman was set up to examine the problems in Brixton, and the Sports Council submitted written evidence as well as making positive proposals to Government for a large-scale sports leadership scheme.'
- 157 The Scarman Report - The Brixton Disorders, 10-12 April 1981. Presented to Parliament by the Secretary of State for the Home Department by command of Her Majesty, November 1981. Penguin Books para 8.44, p.204.
- 158 Sports Council Annual Report 1981-82, p.13.
- 159 See The Sports Council Journal, Sport and Leisure, March/April 1983, Vol. 24, No. 1. 'Metropolitan Police Commissioner, Sir Kenneth Newman wants men to use sport in order to fight crime', p.10. Newman purports to place great importance on developing the role of borough-based consultative committees as proposed by Lord Scarman.
- 160 See The Sports Council Annual Report 1979/1980, Football and the Community - New Partnerships, p.12.
- 161 Sport and Leisure March/April 1983, op.cit.
- 162 Clarke, J. and Critcher, C. (1985) op.cit., p.228.
- 163 Sports Council Annual Report, 1982-83, p.12.
- 164 The Sports Council. Action Sports-West Midlands, The First Annual Report of the Project Directorate 1982-1983, see pp3-4. Strategies and Tactics in the West Midlands Project.
- 165 For instance, a Senior Official in Sandwell Metropolitan Borough indicated, 'Action Sport approaches (inversion of hierarchy) are accepted as long as the Sports Leaders consult the local authority ... The scheme must come into the bureaucracy and be evaluated within a wider framework ... it is not accepted that you can have people doing their own thing.' Interview, 30 May, 1984.

- 166 See Wolverhampton Borough Council (1985) The Social Condition of Young People in Wolverhampton in 1984, pp141-146.
- 167 Regular weekly discussions with a Wolverhampton Action Sport Leader 1983-84.
- 168 Discussion with Sandwell and Wolverhampton Action Sport Leaders 1983-84. Participant observation of C.C.P.R. Community Sports Leaders courses held at West Midlands College of Higher Education, 1982-84.
- 169 West Midlands Regional Sports Council (1983). Paper on 'Younger Target Groups', p.10 which states: 'It is widely accepted that Sport and Recreation has an important role to play with youngsters who benefit physically, socially and psychologically through participation. The indications are that involvement in a predominantly informal programme of activities does lead to a decrease in anti-social behaviour in teenagers. Walsall Police say that vandalism has decreased to a great extent in areas where Action Sport operates. At the Forest School, Walsall a broad community programme, using the very good recreational facilities has led to a decline in the number of cases taken before the judiciary.'
- 170 Wolverhampton Borough Council (1985) The Social Condition of Young People in Wolverhampton in 1984, Chapter XV Summary, Discussion and Recommendations, Section on 'A Philosophy for Change', paras 2.1 to 2.9.
- 171 Quoted in the Preface to the Wolverhampton Borough Council (1985) Report, *ibid*.
- 172 *Ibid*. Chapter XV, para 2.8.

CHAPTER FIVE SPORT, BUSINESS AND THE STATE

1. Brohm, J.M. (1978) Sport: A Prison of Measured Time, Ink Links.
2. Dakin, T. (1972) 'Spin Off from Sport', Marketing, July.
3. Macfarlane, N. (1986) Sport and Politics: A World Divided, Willow Books, pp.192-193.
4. See particularly the Editorial, 'Going Private', Leisure Management Vol. 1, No. 2, Aug./Sept., 1981; Editorial 'Exporting our Expertise' Leisure Management Vol. 3, No. 2 Feb. 1983; and 'A Sporting Chance', Sports Industry Nov./Dec., 1983.
5. The Sports Council (1983) The Financing of Sport in the U.K., Information Series No. 8, p.4.
6. Sports Council Annual Report 1986-87, p.22.
7. Clarke, J. and Critcher, C. (1985) The Devil Makes Work: Leisure in Capitalist Britain, Macmillan.
8. Hargreaves, J. (1986) Sport, Power and Culture, Polity Press, p.222.
9. Inglis, F. (1977) The Name of the Game: Sport and Society, Heinemann, pp.170-189.
10. Hewison, R. (1987) The Heritage Industry: Britain in a Climate of Decline, Methuen, pp.128-129.
11. Macfarlane, N. (1986) op.cit. (Chapter 9, The Case for Sponsorship).
12. Sports Council Annual Report 1986-87, p.3.
13. The Central Council of Physical Recreation (1983) Committee of Enquiry into Sports Sponsorship, The Howell Report, p.11.
14. Ibid., p.13.
15. Inglis, F. (1977) op.cit., p.186.
16. Taylor, P. (1984) Smoke Ring: The Politics of Tobacco, Bodley Head, pp.99-113.
17. See C.C.P.R. (1983) Committee of Enquiry into Sports Sponsorship, op.cit pp.93-95; and Macfarlane, N. (1986) op.cit. pp.188-199.
18. Macfarlane, N. (1986) op.cit p.189, who states:
'I and other MPs have been concerned about the changing attitude of the Sports Council since the arrival of Dick Tracey, my successor as Minister for Sport. The Sports Council has declined to accept tobacco sponsorship itself and has not made its Sports Sponsorship Advisory Service available to tobacco companies ... Recently, there have been developments which one could almost regard as sinister. During the 1986 World Snooker Championship, televised from the

Crucible Theatre, Sheffield, it was hard to spot that the event was sponsored by Embassy ... A spokesman for the Tobacco Advisory Council ... agreed that they understood that Tracey had advised the television people what he expected of them'.; and Sports Council Annual Report 1985-86, p.28.

19. McIntosh, P. and Charlton, V. (1985) The Impact of Sport for All Policy 1966-1984 - And a Way Forward, Sports Council Study No.26, p.47.
20. Taylor, P. (1984) op.cit Introduction, p.IXI.
21. McCormack, M. (1984) What They Don't Teach You at Harvard Business School, Fontana/Collins, p.9.
22. C.C.P.R. (1983) Committee of Enquiry into Sports Sponsorship, op.cit., p.89.
23. Macfarlane, N. (1986), op.cit., p.205.
24. Atkinson, C. (1983) 'Sport, Commerce and the Mass Media: An Area for Local State Intervention?' G.L.C. Conference, Culture Industries and Cultural Policy in London.
25. Whannel, G. (1983) Blowing the Whistle - The Politics of Sport, Pluto Press, pp.85-86.
26. Ibid., p.86.
27. Department of Education and Science, Press Release 35/87, 30 January 1987, 'National Attitudes to Business Must Change says Kenneth Baker'.
28. See Sports Council (1971) Inquiry into Sponsorship, and Sports Council Annual Report 1986-87, p.23.
29. Inglis, F. (1977) 'Sport Cash and Technology', in The Name of the Game - Sport and Society, Heinemann, p.171.
30. Physical Education Department, University of Birmingham (1956) Britain in the World of Sport, The Physical Education Association of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, p.52.
31. Evans, H.J. (1974) Service to Sport: The Story of the C.C.P.R. - 1935-72, Pelham Books Ltd., Chapter Seven.
32. See '1986 and All that - 50 Years of the Bournville Athletic Club 1896-1946'; and, Seebohm Rowntree (1921) the Human Factor in Business - A Description of the Methods Employed in the Cocoa Works York, Longmans, London.
33. P.E. Department, University of Birmingham (1956) Britain in the World of Sport, Physical Education Association of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, refers to the promotion of the British Games 1954 by the News of the World; and, McPartlin, G. (1966) 'Today's Patrons of Sport', Sport and Recreation, Vol.7, No.2, P.10, April, states that in pre-war years a number of national newspapers became identified with various sports, e.g. The News of the World's sponsorship of athletics, and the Daily Mail's interest in flying.

34. Waite, N. (1977) Sponsorship in the U.K., Marketing Communications Research Centre, August.
35. McPartlin, G. (1966), op.cit., p.10.
36. See Howell Report (1983) Committee of Enquiry into Sports Sponsorship, The Central Council of Physical Recreation, pp.8-9. .
37. Exceptions include references to sponsorship in Clarke, J. and Critcher, C. (1985) op.cit., pp.112-115; and Hargreaves, J. (1986) op.cit., pp.118-121.
38. See the Report of the Wolfenden Committee on Sport (1960) Sport and the Community, Central Council of Physical Recreation. Appendix II, Written and Oral Evidence, pp.116-127.
39. McPartlin, G. (1966) op.cit., p.10; Head, V. (1981) Sponsorship: The Newest Marketing Skill, Woodhead-Faulkner Ltd, p.11 indicates that only since the early 1970s did the value of attaching a company name to an event title really become recognised by business.
40. Eglin, R. (1970) 'Pay Up! and Play the Game', Business Observer, 6 September.
41. Dakin, T. (1972) 'Spin Off From Sport', Marketing, July, p.23; and Winsbury, R. (1971) 'Sports Sponsorship Reaches Boom Proportions', Campaign 23 July, p.25.
42. White, Sally (1971) 'Why Business has got so Sporting' The Times 30 June, p.20.
43. Taylor, P. (1984), op.cit., pp.69-70.
44. Ibid., p.281.
45. Ibid., p.1982.
46. The Acumen Marketing Research Group (System Three) (1972) Sponsorship, December.
47. Waite, N. (1977) op.cit., pp.11-12.
48. Way, David (1980) 'Sponsorship', John Player and Sons unpub. paper.
49. Ibid.
50. Atkinson, C. (1983), op.cit., p.2; Whannel, G. (1983), op.cit., Chapter 4, 'Playing under Capitalism'.
51. The Sports Council (1971) 'An Inquiry into Sponsorship', Working Party chaired by W.J. Hicks.
52. Greig, G. (1970) 'Sport and Smoking ... The Government Warns the Sponsors to Cut Down their Budget', Daily Mail, 7 April.
53. Keating, F. (1977) 'Smoke Signals', The Guardian, 11 March.

54. Howell Report (1983), op.cit., and Macfarlane, N. (1986), op.cit., Ch.9, 'The Case for Sponsorship'.
55. Howell Report (1983), ibid., para.13.19, p.94.
56. Ibid., para.13.18, and Conclusion 13.20, p. 94.
57. Way, D. (1980), op.cit.
58. Howell Report (1983), op.cit., p.21.
59. See Taylor, P. (1984), op.cit., p.281.
60. Interview with executive, Public Relations Department, The Coca-Cola Export Corporation, London, April 1977.
61. Howell Report (1983), op.cit., Chapter 4 'The Diary' (Diary of Sponsorship activities August 1981 to May 1983), p.100.
62. For example, The Dolphin Trophy 'Learn to Swim' Awards Scheme entry form 1977, which indicates that the scheme had been sponsored by the British Bottlers of Coca-Cola since 1963 as part of a national youth programme; and Competition brochure and entry form, 'Answer the call of the Sea' (open to young people 12-20) - A Sailing scheme offering prizes of an adventure cruise aboard a sailing ship, a dinghy sailing course, and a book about the sea, Coca-Cola in conjunction with the Association of Sea Training Organisations.

The Multi-national firm Esso provides another example of business sponsorship interest in the youth market through the schools-based Five-Star Award Scheme in athletics. Esso announced in 1979 their takeover of this scheme, Times Educational Supplement 16 November, 1979.
63. Waite, N. (1977) op.cit., p.21.
64. Dakin, Tony (1972) Spin Off From Sport, Marketing, July.
65. Taylor, P. (1984) op.cit., p.68.
66. Inglis, F. (1977) op.cit., p.189.
67. Way, D. (1980) op.cit.
68. Ibid.
69. Howell Report (1983) op.cit., p.71.
70. Ibid.
71. Ibid.
72. Clarke, J. and Critcher, C. (1985) op.cit., p.114.
73. Howell Report (1983) op.cit., p.71.
74. Ibid., p.45.

75. Clarke, J. and Critcher, C. (1985), op.cit., p.116.
76. See Howell Report (1983), op.cit., p.47, Table 8.4 'Top 35 Sponsored Sports Events 1982) Receiving Television Network coverage'.
77. Inglis, F. (1977), op.cit., p.185.
78. Clarke, J. and Critcher, C. (1985), op.cit., p.115.
79. Howell Report (1983), op.cit., p.77.
80. Ibid.
81. Ibid., p.78.
82. Burles, J. (1981) 'Show Business - Seb Coe says athletics is getting too much like the movies', Sport and Leisure, October/November.
83. Department of the Environment White Paper (1975) Sport and Recreation Cmnd 6200. The Sports Aid Foundation was established in 1976 following the publication of the White paper. It was founded as an independent organisation and its function is to assist with the expenses of non-professional individual competitors preparing and training for certain specified major competitions. Howell Report, (1983), op.cit., p.24.
84. House of Commons Debate on 'Leisure: Sport and the Arts'. 25 January 1980.
85. Jongh, N. De, (1980) 'Business backing sought to reduce level of state aid - Stevas launches drive for more arts sponsorship' The Guardian, 11 June.
86. Sports Council Annual Report 1981-82, p.5.
87. Macfarlane, N (1986) Sport and Politics: A World Divided, Willow Boosk, p.108.
88. 'There's a great industry in other people's leisure', (1983). Margaret Thatcher, interviewed in The Director, August.
89. Sports Council Annual Report 1986-87, p.3.
90. Howell Report (1983), op.cit., Chapter Twelve: 'Sports Agencies', p.83.
91. Howell Report (1983), op.cit., Chapter Thirteen: 'Ethical Considerations', para.12.7, pp.89-90.
92. Ibid., para. 13.8, p.90.
93. Ibid., para. 19.9, pp.90-91.
94. Ibid., p.89.
95. Ibid., p.92.
96. Ibid., Conclusion One, p.5.

97. Ibid., para. 12.5, p.84.
98. The Sports Council (1982) Sport in the Community - The Next Ten Years.
99. Howell Report (1983), op.cit., p.86.
100. Ibid., p.84.
101. Ibid., p.7, Table, 1.1.
102. Thomas, M.J. (1984) 'Putting Politics in the Shop Window' Times Higher Educational Supplement, 20 April, p.14.
103. Howell Report, (1983), op.cit., p.90.
104. Inglis, F. (1977), op.cit., p.186.
105. Ibid., Introduction, p.ix.
106. Fred Inglis acknowledges the time and help he received from a number of individuals in writing his book, including Denis Howell The Name of the Game (1977) Introduction. Neil Macfarlane in Sport and Politics (1986) includes in the Bibliography as general background, Inglis, F. 1977) The Name of the Game, Heinemann.
107. See Howell Report (1983), op.cit., p.9, para. 2.2, Previous Research 1971-1982.
108. Whannel, G. (1983) Blowing the Whistle: The Politics of Sport, Pluto Press, pp.86 and 112.
109. Clarke, J. and Critcher, C. (1985), op.cit., p.232.
110. Ibid., pp.232-233.
111. Howell Report (1983), op.cit., p.55.
112. Ibid., p.64.
113. See Sports Sponsorship Advisory Service (1984) U.K Companies, Products and the Sports They Sponsor, Sports Council and Central Council of Physical Recreation; and Sports Sponsorship Advisory Service (1987) Reported U.K. Companies, Products and the Sports They Sponsor, Sports Council and Central Council of Physical Recreation.
114. Howell Report (1983), op.cit., p.11, Table 2.1, Estimated Sponsorship by Sport 1982, and p66 Table 9.7 Projection of Total Local Sponsorship in the Sports Council Regions of England (based on a survey of commercial sponsorship in Stratford-on-Avon 1982). See also, Ibid.
115. Howell Report (1983), op.cit., Chapter Nine, 'National, Regional and Local Sponsorship'.
116. Ibid., p.57.

117. Sports Sponsorship Advisory Service (1984) and (1987) Sports Council/C.C.P.R., op.cit.
118. Howell Report (1983), p.59, para. 9.12, West Midlands Region.
119. Howell Report (1983), p.58, para. 9.10, North West Region.
120. Gratton, C. and Taylor, P. (1987) Leisure in Britain, Letchworth Pubs., pp.60-61.
121. Ibid., p.61.
122. Howell Report (1983), op.cit., p.64, para. 9.20 'West Midlands', and p.65, Table 9.5 'West Midlands Region 1982 - Major Sponsors Identified'. 'In addition, Derek Etherington, the Sports Council's Advisor on Sponsorship, indicated in 1984 that, 'recent growth industries were Building and Allied Trades, Insurance and Electrical'. See 'The Current Sports Sponsorship Market Place', Notes from Derek Etherington's Presentation to West Midlands Businessmen in 1984. (West Midlands Regional Sports Council).
123. Anthony, D. (1980) A Strategy for British Sport, C. Hurst and Co., pp.61-63.
124. The enquiry relating to the three business firms included interviews in 1984 with company managers, regional Sports Council staff and Local Sports Council staff, in addition to analysis of company advertising leaflets, newspapers and historical documents.
125. See Howell Report (1983), op.cit., p.11, Table 2.1, 'Estimated Sponsorship by Sports 1982', and p.15 Table 2.6, 'Top 20 Sports on Television 1982'.
126. Paul Willis' work in Wolverhampton Metropolitan Borough indicates that transistions for many youths had been blocked through high levels of unemployment - transitions into work, into being a consumer, into a separate household. He points out that this meant an empty period of time characterised by lack of cash and massively increased dependence on the state, and that much of this time was spent hanging around the commercial shopping precincts. Willis, P. (1983) 'Youth Unemployment: Thinking and Unthinkable', August unpub. and Willis, P. (1985) The Social Condition of Young People in Wolverhampton in 1984, Wolverhampton Borough Council.
127. 'Tarmac World', Number 145, May/June, 1986, Employee New Section. Interview with Brewery Sales Promotion Manager August, 1984 also indicated that a 'Heads of Industry Group' in the West Midlands region were examining the impact of unemployment, and that the brewery had made some contribution to limiting its effects by attempting to 'boost the spirit of the region with a Community Award Scheme'. This involved arranging competitions for youth clubs and groups who undertook activities such as aiding senior citizens.
128. Interviews with executives of the Sandwell Hypermarket, July 1984, and the Black Country Brewery, August 1984. The Hypermarket executive indicated: 'Within sports sponsorship the company is selective, considering only those events which are assisting charities ... The range and level of sponsorship is decided by the Store Director within a PR budget of approximately £14,000 per year

... The object is to achieve good community relations ... I rely on these people for my living, so it is worthwhile to channel money back into the community ... customers tell me how much the sponsorship interest is valued ... we do not wish to be associated with events which are not a success'.

The Brewery Sales Manager indicated:

'There is a tradition of sponsorship as part of promotions within the consortium ... the separate regions are concerned with local rather than national events. 1983 involved approximately £10,000 for the W. Region sponsorship ... only about 2 events ever reach £1,000 - others are for approximately £100 or £200 ... sponsorship constitutes 90% of the promotion budget for the region ... basically we are concerned that more people use our public houses ... Criteria for considering sponsors are: no dangerous activities; whether it benefits the community; the number of people involved; whether well received (This is assessed at the end of the event)'.

129. The document Sponsorship Who Needs It (1978) published by The West Midlands Council for Sport and Recreation is a basic guide to sponsorship for local sports organisations. It deals with the topics: What can be sponsored, How to find a Sponsor, and Making the Most of Sponsorship. The Introduction states: 'Whether your club or organisation is small or large, involved in mainly local activities, or operating on a national scale, the principles involved in seeking, retaining and making the best of sponsorship are the same; that is, to succeed in finding a sponsor, in retaining his interest and achieving the maximum for him and your sport'.
130. Consultation with member of staff, West Midlands Sports Council, March 1988. Staff in other regions of the Sports Council had made similar comments in 1982-83. The Director of the Greater London and South East Region is quoted in the Howell Report (1983), p.58 as follows:

... 'We have not sought to increase our sponsored events as pressure on staff-time in work areas regarded as of higher priority has limited the amount of time we could give to these activities ... it is our view that more sponsors could be found ... and the main inhibiting factor is the ability of our office to absorb additional events'.

The Director of the Southern Region was also reported to have stated:

'We have been closely involved in discussions and have come to the conclusion that there is a need, at regional level, for a sports sponsorship consultancy. But because of other important work this has been given a lower priority in terms of work commitment'.
131. Interview with Birmingham City Council official, June 1984.
132. Ibid.,
133. Birmingham District Council Elections 1984, The Labour Party Manifesto, p.3., 'Economic Development'.
134. Samuel, John (1986) 'Burning the Weekend Oil in Birmingham' The Guardian 28 November.

135. Hirst, P. and Zeitlin, J. (1988) 'Crisis What Crisis?', New Statesman, 18 March.
136. A form of 'rational recreation' would appear to be depicted in the following statements:

The Labour Party Manifesto, Birmingham (1984), op.cit., p.16., 'Leisure Services' indicated, 'Labour is committed to developing a full network of decent and adequate leisure services across the city to increase people's awareness and appreciation of our diverse cultural heritage, and to assist the increasing number of people with spare time on their hands, to spend it in a worthwhile, constructive and enjoyable way'.

James Munn (1986) 'Future Trends in Leisure and Recreation' The British Journal of Physical Education Vol. 17, No.3 May/June stated, 'While management may not be our first consideration when we pursue our leisure activity or interest it will be that factor ... which will determine how frequently and how positively we do so. Therefore, leisure services and education department policies, within a post-industrial society, would be based on a concept which accepted that it was not as important for people simply to use our organised leisure and recreation resources as it is that they learn how to use their leisure in satisfying and creative ways'.
137. This contrasts with the position adopted by Wolverhampton Borough Council in 1985 in their formal endorsement of The Youth Team Report The Social Condition of Young People in Wolverhampton in 1984 which argued for maximising the autonomies and powers of those unduly affected by change.
138. Particularly the case in The Metropolitan Borough of Dudley. Interview with Council official and member, June 1984.
139. Hargreaves, J. (1986), op.cit., pp.217-218.
140. Heinz Schools Foundation Free Equipment Catalogue (closing date for entries indicated 31 January, 1981) and enclosed copy of letter to headteachers.
141. Ibid., letter to headteachers.
142. B.B.C. 4, 'You and Yours' programme, 23 October 1980.
143. The background to the 1986 Commonwealth Games indicated the blatant opportunism - political and commercial - in international sport. Macfarlane, N. (1986), op.cit., p.255 comments, 'Of 58 nations due to compete, now fewer than 32 had stayed away ordered to do so by governments angered by Mrs Thatcher's reluctance to impose economic sanctions on P.W. Botha's regime in South Africa ...'; and p.260, '... a few weeks before the games were due to begin, the Organising Committee had to confess they had raised only £10 million (of an estimated requirement of £14 million) ... Robert Maxwell rode to what he and the committee hoped would be the rescue ... He confessed that

some sponsors had withdrawn ... The weekend the Games ended Maxwell announced that his old friend Ryiochi Sasakawa, a billionaire philanthropist from Japan, had pledged his financial support for the Games ...'

144. See Offe, C (1984) Contradictions of the Welfare State, Hutchinson Chapter 6.
145. Hargreaves, J. (1985) 'From Social Decocracy to Authoritarian Populism: State Intervention in Sport and Physical Recreation in Contemporary Britain', Leisure Studies, May.

CHAPTER SIX

POLITICAL FUTURES

1. Department of the Environment, 19 November, 1987, News Release 475, 'Review of Sports Policy'.
2. Letter from Colin Moynihan, MP, Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State, to John Smith, Chairman, The Sports Council dated 19 November, 1987.
3. Ibid.
4. Hall, S. (1987) 'Blue Election, Election Blues', Marxism Today, July.
5. See Central Statistical Office (1987) Social Trends, No. 17, H.M.S.O. Section on 'Social Trends Since World War II' (A.H. Halsey), p.11, and Section on 'Unemployment', p.79.
6. Hall, S. (1988) 'Thatcher's Lessons', Marxism Today, March.
7. Clarke, J. and Critcher, C. (1985) The Devil Makes Work: Leisure in Capitalist Britain, Macmillan, pp.201-202.
8. Hargreaves, J. (1986) Sport, Power and Culture, Polity Press, pp.220-223. See also Rees-Mogg, William (1988) 'The decline of the Olympics into physical and moral squalor', The Independent, 19 April.
9. Sports Council (1987) Sport in the Community ... Which Ways Forward?. - A Paper for Consultation, p.6 and p.16.
10. Department of the Environment, 21 March, 1988, News Release 170, 'Colin Moynihan sets up a Major Review of Sport and Recreation Provision in Inner Cities'.
11. Ibid.
12. See Greater London Council Women's Committee Minutes W117, Report 7 February 1983, by Director General, 'Study of Sports and Recreation Centres: Women's Aspects'.
13. Panorama BBC1, 11 April 1988. Leader of Sheffield City Council indicated that they were planning to raise £100 million from industry.
14. Interview with Birmingham City Council officials and councillor, June 1984.
15. Wolverhampton Borough Council (1985) The Social Condition of Young People in Wolverhampton in 1984.
16. Hall, S. (1988) 'Thatcher's Lessons', Marxism Today, March.
17. Hobsbawm, E. (1988) 'No Sense of Mission', Marxism Today, April.
18. An exception would be Whannel, G. (1983) Blowing the Whistle: The Politics of Sport, Pluto Press in the series, 'Arguments for Socialism'.

19. Hall, S. (1984) 'The Culture Gap' Marxism Today, January.
20. Ibid.
21. Judith Mackay whose biographical details were given as: Trained and worked professionally in the television and film industries; Member of the Sports Council since 1982; Chairman of the West Midlands Regional Council for Sport and Recreation; Chairman of the National Coaching Foundation; Director of Birmingham Repertory Theatre.
22. Hargreaves, Jennifer (1984) 'Taking men on at their Games', Marxism Today, August.
23. Sports Council Annual Report 1986-87, p.53.
24. Hargreaves, J. (1986) op.cit., p.223.
25. Cockburn, C. (1988) 'Macho Men of the Left', Marxism Today, April.
26. Gramsci, A. (1971) Selections from Prison Notebooks, Lawrence and Wishart, pp.330-331.
27. Ibid.
28. Department of the Environment (1975) Sport and Recreation London H.M.S.O. Cmd, 6200, paras, 62-63, p.18.
29. Letter from Colin Moynihan, M.P. Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State, to John Smith, Chairman, The Sports Council, 19 November 1987.
30. See Gray, Robert (1982) 'Left holding the Flag' Marxism Today, November, p.27.
31. Whannel, G. (1983) op.cit., p.108.
32. Clarke, J. and Critcher, C. (1985) op.cit., pp.228-229.
33. Hargreaves, J. (1986) op.cit., p.217.
34. Clarke, J. and Critcher, C. (1985) op.cit., pp.232-233.
35. Hargreaves, J. (1986) op.cit., p.223.
36. Ibid.
37. Roberts, K. (1978) Contemporary Society and the Growth of Leisure, Longman; and Roberts, K. (1981) Leisure, Longman 2nd ed.
38. Veal, A.J. (1987) Leisure and the Future, Allen and Unwin.
39. Roberts, K. (1981) op.cit., p.90.
40. See Bennis, W. and Slater, P. (1968) The Temporary Society, Harper and Row; Toffler, A. (1970) Future Shock, Random House; Halmos, P. (1970) The Personal Service Society, Constable; Touraine, A. (1971) The Post-Industrial Society, Random House; and Bell, D. (1974) The Coming of Post-Industrial Society, Basic Books.

41. Miles, R.E. (1977) Awakening from the American Dream, Marion Boyars/Open Forum; Hirsch, F. (1977) The Social Limits to Growth, Routledge; Tiryakian, E.A. (1978) 'The Time Perspectives of Modernity', Society and Leisure, 1, 125; and Illich, I (1978) The Right to Useful Unemployment. Marion Boyars.
42. Roberts, K. (1981) op.cit., p.125.
43. Roberts, K. (1978) op.cit., p.123.
44. Roberts, K. (1981) op.cit., p.126.
45. Veal, A.J. (1987) Leisure and the Future, Allen and Unwin.
46. Veal, A.J. (1987) Ibid., Chapter Three reproduces Bell's five dimensions of the term 'post-industrialism, (the change from a goods producing to a service economy; the pre-eminence of the professional/technical class; the centrality of theoretical knowledge; the control of technology; and the creation of a new intellectual technology) with some discussion, and sevenfold characteristics of Stonier (predominating knowledge industries; labour-dominated by information operatives; credit-based economy; trans-national economy; institutionalised economy; unprecedented affluence; exponential rather than linear change). He concludes that Bell virtually ignores the leisure dimension, and Stonier is not particularly forthcoming on the topic.
47. See Kumar, K. (1978) Prophecy and Progress, Allen Lane; and Touraine, A. (1974) The Post-Industrial Society, London: Wildwood House.
48. Veal, A.J. (1987) op.cit., p.178, and Roberts, K. (1981) op.cit., pp.79-83.
49. Deem, R. (1986) All Work and No Play - A Study of Women and Leisure, Open University Press.
50. Clarke, J. and Critcher, C. (1985) op.cit., p.187.
51. Hoch, P. (1972) Rip Off the Big Game: The Exploitation of Sports by the Power Elite, Anchor Books, p.7.
52. Ibid., p.133.
53. Ibid.
54. Brohm, J.M. (1978) Sport - A Prison of Measured Time, Ink Links, p.1.
55. Ibid., pp.173-174.
56. Hall, Stuart and Jacques, Martin (1988) '1968' Marxism Today, May.
57. Brohm, J.M. (1978) op.cit., p.34.
58. Cockburn, C. (1988) 'Macho Men of the Left', Marxism Today.
59. See Clarke, J. and Critcher, C. (1985) op.cit. Chapter 6, 'Future Imperfect: Leisure and the Post-Industrial Society'.

60. Ibid., p.198.
61. Ibid., pp.239-240.
62. Williams, R. (1983) Towards 2000, Chatto and Windus, pp.100-101 and p.256.
63. Ibid., p.252.
64. Fergusson, R. and Mardle, G. (1981) Education and the Political Economy of Leisure in Education and the State, (Eds.) Dale, R. et. al., Open University Reader, E353 Course.
65. Deem, R. (1986) op.cit., p.10.
66. See Rojek, C. (1985) Capitalism and Leisure Theory, Tavistock Publications.
67. Hall, S. (1988) Thatcher's Lessons, Marxism Today, March.
68. Williams, R. (1983) op.cit., pp.253-255.
69. Offe, C. (1984) Contradictions of the Welfare State, Hutchinson, p.294.
70. Hargreaves, J. (1986) op.cit., p.220.
71. Offe, C. (1984) op.cit. Chapter 12 'Reflections on the welfare state and the future of socialism'. (An interview of Claus Offe conducted by David Held and John Keane, November/December 1982), p.295.
72. Hargreaves, J. (1986) op.cit., pp.220-223.
73. Williams, R. (1983) op.cit., pp.268-269.
74. Hobsbawm, E. (1988) 'Rethinking Labour: No Sense of Mission', Marxism Today, April.
75. Devine, P. (1988) 'Market Mania of the Left', Marxism Today, June.
76. Poulantzas, N. (1980) State, Power and Socialism, New Left Books; Held, D. (Ed.) (1983) States and Societies, Martin Robertson/Open University; Offe, C. (1984) Contradictions of the Welfare State, Hutchinson; Hall, S. (1984) 'The State: Socialism's Old Caretaker', Marxism Today, November; Hall, S. (1985) 'Realignment for What?' Marxism Today, December; Hall, S. (1988) 'Thatcher's Lessons', Marxism Today, March.
77. Conference of Socialist Economists (1979) In and Against the State, London-Edinburgh Weekend Return Group.
78. Willis, P. (1983) Youth Unemployment: Thinking the Unthinkable, August, unpublished.
79. Hall, S. (1984) 'The Culture Gap', Marxism Today, January.
80. Coalter, F. et. al. (1986) Rationale for Public Sector Investment in Leisure, Sports Council/E.S.R.C.

81. Ibid., p.170.
82. Hall, S. (1984) 'The Culture Gap', Marxism Today, January.
83. Devine, P. (1988), op.cit.,
84. Brohm, J.M. (1978), op.cit.
85. Greater London Council, Women's Committee, Report 7 February, 1983 by Director-General, Item W117 Study of Sports and Recreation Centres: Women's Aspects.
86. Cockburn, C. (1988) 'Macho Men of the Left', Marxism Today, April.
87. See Noel-Baker, P. (1979) 'The Ethics of Sport', Acceptance Speech Hon DSc, Loughborough University, in Document on Philip Noel-Baker on Sport, published by The Centre for International Sports Studies and the Central Bureau for Educational Visits and Exchanges with the support of UNESCO.
88. Offe, C. (1984), op.cit., Chapter 12 'Reflections on the Welfare State and the Future of Socialism'. Interview conducted with Claus Offe by David Held and John Keane, December 1982, p.299.
89. Editorial (1988) 'Answering Acheson' Times Higher Educational Supplement, 24 June.
90. Hall, S. (1984) 'The Culture Gap', Marxism Today, January.
91. Whannel, G. (1983), op.cit., p.105.
92. Ibid., pp.105-112.
93. Clarke, J. and Critcher, C. (1985) op.cit., pp.239-240.
94. Thompson, E.P. (1967) 'Time, Work-Discipline, and Industrial Capitalism', Past and Present, Number 38, December.
95. For an alternative interpretation to structuralist and culturalist Marxist accounts of 'civilising' and 'improvement' as ideological constructs see Elias, N. and Dunning, E. (1986) Quest for Excitement: Sport and Leisure in the Civilising Process. This is based on an approach to social inquiry termed as 'figurational sociology'. Norbert Elias and his followers have conceptualised figurations as multiple networks of interdependence which both constrain and enable the actions of individuals. The emphasis is on theory which studies social relations processually, and there are similarities with the 'theory of structuration' advocated by Anthony Giddens. There is some debate as to how far the figurational approach represents a weak form of functionalism (see Hargreaves, J. (1982) Sport, Culture and Ideology, R.K.P. Chapter Two and Rojek, C. (1985) Capitalism and Leisure Theory, Tavistock Pubs. Chapter 7). In figurational sociology, 'the civilising process refers to a specific set of changes in people's personality structure' (Rojek). There is, however, a tendency in this approach to underestimate the significance of conflicts relating to social class, race and sex in the integration and dynamics of capitalism. As Rojek (1985) states in summarising critiques of the Eliasian position, 'Meanings under capitalism are not constructed by the individual's position in the dynamic web of interdependencies, but

by the general power dialectics which give capitalism its distinctive shape and form'.

96. Clarke, J. and Critcher, C. (1985) op.cit., p.233.
97. Thompson, E.P. (1967) op.cit., p.95.
98. Foster, J. (1988) 'Moynihan calls for single Sports Lobby', The Independent, 2 July.
99. Editorial (1988) 'In Corpore Sano', Evening Standard, 30 June.
100. Williams, R (1983) Towards 2000, Chatto and Windus.

APPENDIX

SCHEDULE OF INTERVIEWS

Interviews were held with an extensive number of selected individuals, mainly during the period 1977-84. These totalled 84 meetings with personnel of various levels of official status from a range of institutions - including sports organisations, physical education associations, local authorities and business firms. In particular, interviews were undertaken with men and women from the following establishments:

1. National Organisations of Sport

Present and former senior officers of the Central Council of Physical Recreation, and the Sports Council (Headquarters, and the West Midlands Region), plus four national Sports Council members.

2. Physical Education Bodies

Her Majesty's Inspectorate (Physical Education), Local Authority Advisers, University and College Lecturers, officers of the British Association of Advisers and Lecturers in Physical Education, and the Physical Education Association of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

3. Governing Bodies of Sport

This included national coaches from athletics, rugby and judo and an officer of the Federation of Sport and Recreation.

4. Local Authorities

The main focus was on the West Midlands region, and involved a series of interviews conducted with County and Metropolitan authorities in 1978 and a further concentration on metropolitan boroughs during 1984.

In 1978 this included senior officers of the following councils:

City of Birmingham

Cannock Chase District Council

Coventry Metropolitan District Council

Metropolitan Borough of Dudley

Lichfield District Council

Metropolitan Borough of Sandwell

Tamworth Borough Council

Metropolitan Borough of Walsall

North Warwickshire Council

Metropolitan Borough of Wolverhampton

In 1984 both senior officers and members were interviewed from:

Birmingham City Council

Coventry City Council

Metropolitan Borough of Dudley

Metropolitan Borough of Sandwell

Metropolitan Borough of Solihull

Metropolitan Borough of Walsall

Metropolitan Borough of Wolverhampton

In addition, meetings were held with representatives from:

The Arts and Recreation Policy Group

Greater London Council

The Recreation, Tourism, Countryside, Canals and Environmental

Quality Group, West Midlands County Council

5. Local Sports Councils

Interviews were conducted during 1984 of officers of the following

Local Sports Councils in the West Midlands Region:

Birmingham

Coventry

Dudley

Sandwell

Solihull

Walsall

Wolverhampton

6. Business Firms

Firms consulted, particularly on the topic of 'sponsorship of sport' were:

Bass Mitchell and Butler

Cadbury Schweppes

Coca-Cola Export Corporation

Sava Centre

Schweppes

John Player and Sons

Others

These included:

Recreation Management consultants, Leisure Studies Association officers, a former official of the British Workers Sports Federation, members of the Yates Committee on Recreation and Management Training.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

This Bibliography comprises the following sections:

1. Books and Articles.
2. Official Publications
 - (a) H.M.S.O.
 - (b) Other
3. Journals and Newspapers.

1. BOOKS AND ARTICLES

Allison, L. (Ed.) (1986) The Politics of Sport, Manchester University Press.

Anthony, D. (1983) A Strategy for British Sport, C. Hurst and Co.

Atkinson, C. (1983) Sport Commerce and the Mass Media: An Area of Local State Intervention, Cultural Industries and Cultural Policy in London, Greater London Council, December.

Bacon, A.W. (1981) The Role of the State in U.K. Leisure Research and Planning Processes, University of Salford

Bailey, P. (1979) Leisure and Class in Victorian England, Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Bell, D. (1974) The Coming of Post-Industrial Society, Basic Books

Bennett, T. et al. (1982) Popular Culture, Past and Present, London: Croom Helm.

Benington, J. (1976) Local Government Becomes Big Business 2nd Edition, Information and intelligence Unit.

Benyon, J. (Ed.) (1984) Scarman and After - Essays Reflecting on Lord Scarman's Report, the Riots and their Aftermath, Pergamon Press.

Bernbaum, G. (Ed.) (1979) Schooling in Decline, Macmillan.

Bogdanor, V. and Skidelsky, R. (Eds.) (1970) The Age of Affluence 1951-1964, Macmillan.

Boggs, C. (1976) Gramsci's Marxism, Pluto Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1978) Sport and Social Class, Social Science Information, XVIII, 6, 821.

Bowles, S. and Gintis, H. (1976) Schooling in Capitalist America, Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Bramham, P. (1984) Giddens in Goal: Reconstructing the Social Theory of Sport, In P. Bramham et al. New Directions in Leisure Studies,

Department of Applied and Community Studies, Bradford and Ilkley Community College.

Bramham, P. and Henry, I.P. (1985) Political Ideology and Leisure Policy in the United Kingdom, Leisure Studies, 4, 1-19.

Branson, N. and Heinemann, M. (1971) Britain in the Nineteen Thirties, Weidenfeld and Nicolson, London.

Braverman, H. (1974) Labor and Monopoly Capital, Monthly Review Press.

Brohm, J.M. (1978) Sport: A Prison of Measured Time, Ink Links

Bullock, A. and Shock, M. (Ed.) (1967) The Liberal Tradition, Oxford University Press.

Cantelon, H. and Gruneau, R. (1982) Sport, Culture and the Modern State, University of Toronto Press.

Castells, M. (1977) The Urban Question, Edward Arnold.

Castells, M. (1978) City, Class and Power, Macmillan Press.

Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies (1981) Unpopular Education: Schooling and Social Democracy in England Since 1944, Hutchinson.

Cherry, G. (1982) The Politics of Town Planning, Longman.

Clarke, J. et al. (1979) Working Class Culture: Studies in History and Theory, Hutchinson.

Clarke, J. and Critcher, C. (1985) The Devil Makes Work: Leisure in Capitalist Britain, Macmillan.

Coalter, F. et al. (1986) Rationale for Public Sector Investment in Leisure, Sports Council/E.S.R.C.

Cockburn, C. (1977) The Local State: Management of Cities and People, London Pluto Press.

Corrigan, P. (Ed.) (1980) Capitalism, State Formation and Marxist Theory, Quartet Books.

Crouch, C. (1979) State and Economy in Contemporary Capitalism, Croom Helm.

Cunningham, H. (1980) Leisure in the Industrial Revolution, Croom Helm.

Dale, R. (1979) Education and the State, Block 1, Unit 3 of Society, Education and the State, E353, Open University.

Dale, R. et al. (1981) Education and the State, Vols. I and II, Falmer Press/Open University.

Davies, B. (1986) Threatening Youth - Towards a National Youth Policy, Open University Press.

- Davies, D. (1979) Popular Culture, Class and Schooling, Block 3, Unit 9 of Society, Education and the State, E353, Open University.
- Deem, R. (1986) All Work and No Play: A Study of Women and Leisure, Open University Press.
- Duffield, B. et al. (Eds.) (1982) A Digest of Sports Statistics, The Sports Council.
- Dunning, E. (1971) The Sociology of Sport, Cass, London.
- Dunning, E and Sheard, K.. (1979) Barbarians, Gentlemen and Players, Martin Robertson.
- Edwards, H. (1973) The Sociology of Sport, Illinois, Dorsey Press.
- Elias, N. and Dunning, E. (1986) Quest for Excitement: Sport and Leisure in the Civilising Process, Blackwell.
- Esland, G. and Cathcart, H. (1979) Education and the Corporate Economy, Block 1, Unit 2 of Society, Education and the State, E353, Open University.
- Fletcher, C. and Thompson, N. (1980) Issues in Community Education, The Falmer Press.
- Evans, H.J. (1974) Service to Sport: The Story of the C.C.P.R. - 1935 to 1972, Pelham Books.
- Fergusson, R. and Mardle, G. (1981) Education and the Political Economy of Leisure, In R. Dale et al. (Eds.) Education and the State, Vol.II, Falmer Press/Open University Press.
- Fyvel, T.R. (1963) The Insecure Offenders, Chatto and Windus.
- George, V. and Wilding, P. (1976) Ideology and Social Welfare, Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Giddens, A. (1982) Profiles and Critiques in Social Theory, The Macmillan Press.
- Gough, I. (1979) The Political Economy of the Welfare State, London: Macmillan.
- Gramsci, A. (1971) Selections from the Prison Notebooks, London: Lawrence and Wishart.
- Gratton, C. and Taylor, P. (1987) Leisure in Britain, Leisure Pubs. (Letchworth) Ltd.
- Habermas, J. (1976) Legitimation Crisis, Macmillan.
- Hall, S. and Jacques, M. (Ed.) (1983) The Politics of Thatcherism, Lawrence Wishart.
- Hall, S. (1984) 'The Culture Gap', Marxism Today, January.
- Hall, S. (1984) 'The State: Socialism's Old Caretaker', Marxism Today, November.

- Hall, S. (1987) 'Gramsci and Us', Marxism Today, June.
- Hall, S. and Jacques, M. (1988) '1968' Marxism Today, May.
- Hargreaves, J. (1981) The Political Economy of Mass Sport, In R. Dale et al. (Eds.) Education and the State, Vol.II, Falmer Press/Open University Press.
- Hargreaves, J. (Ed.) (1982) Sport, Culture and Ideology, Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Hargreaves, J. (1984) State Intervention in Sport and Hegemony in Britain, Leisure Studies Association Conference.
- Hargreaves, J. (1985) From Social Democracy to Authoritarian Populism: State Intervention in Sport and Physical Recreation in Contemporary Britain, Leisure Studies, 4, 219-226.
- Hargreaves, J. (1986) Sport, Power and Culture, Polity Press.
- Head, V. (1981) Sponsorship: The Newest Marketing Skill, Woodhead-Faulkner.
- Held, D. (1980) Introduction to Critical Theory, Hutchinson.
- Held, D. (Ed.) (1983) States and Societies, Martin Robertson.
- Hendry, L.B. (1978) School, Sport, Leisure: Three Dimensions of Adolescence, London: Lepus.
- Henry, I. and Bramham, P. (1986) Leisure, the Local State and Social Order, Leisure Studies 5, 186-209.
- Hewison, R. (1987) The Heritage Industry: Britain in a Climate of Decline, Methuen.
- Hill, H. (1980) Freedom to Roam - The Struggle for Access to Britain's Moors and Mountains, Moorland Pub. Co.
- Hillman, M. and Whalley, A. (1977) Fair Play for All, P.E.P. Broadsheet 571, Policy Studies Institute, London.
- Hirsch, F. (1977) The Social Limits to Growth, Routledge.
- Hoch, P. (1972) Rip Off the Big Game, Anchor Books.
- Holloway, J. and Piccioto, S. (Eds.) (1979) State and Capital, London: Edward Arnold.
- Hood, C. (1973) The Rise and Rise of the British Quango, New Society, 16 August.
- Hynes, S. (1968) The Edwardian Turn of Mind, Princeton University Press.
- Ingham, R. (Ed.) (1978) Football Hooliganism and the Skinheads, Inter-Action.

- Inglis, F. (1977) The Name of the Game: Sport and Society, Heinemann.
- Jessop, B. (1982) The Capitalist State, Martin Robertson.
- Johnson, R. (1979) Popular Politics, Education and the State, Block 1, Unit 1 of Society, Education and the State E353, Open University.
- Johnson, T.J. (1972) Professions and Power, Macmillan.
- Kew, S. (1979) Ethnic Groups and Leisure, S.S.R.C./Sports Council.
- King, R. (Ed.) (1983) Capital and Politics, Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Kumar, K. (1978) Prophecy and Progress, Allen Lane.
- Larrain, J. (1979) The Concept of Ideology, London: Hutchinson.
- Lawless, P. (1979) Urban Deprivation and Government Initiative, Faber.
- Loney, M. (1986) The New Right and the Welfare State, Pluto Press.
- Loy, G.W. and Kenyon, G.S. (1969) Sport, Culture and Society, London: Macmillan.
- McCormack, M.H. (1984) What They Don't Teach You at Harvard Business School, William Collins.
- Macfarlane, N. (1986) Sport and Politics, Willow Books.
- McIntosh, P. (1963) Sport and Society, New Thinker's Library.
- McIntosh, P. (1968) Physical Education in England Since 1800, G. Bell and Sons Ltd.
- McIntosh, P. (1979) Fair Play: Ethics in Sport and Education, Heinemann.
- McIntosh, P. (1980) Sport for All Programmes Throughout the World, I.C.S.S.P.E./U.N.E.S.C.O.
- McIntosh, P. and Charlton, V. (1985) The Impact of Sport for All Policy 1966-1984 and a Way Forward, The Sports Council.
- Mandel, E. (1975) Late Capitalism, London: New Left Books.
- Mandell, R.D. (1976) The First Olympics, University of California Press.
- Mangan, J.A. (Ed.) (1973) Physical Education and Sport: Sociological and Cultural Perspectives, Basil Blackwell.
- Mangan, J.A. and Par, R.J. (Eds.) (1987) From Fair Sex to Feminism: Sport and the Socialisation of Women in the Industrial and Post-Industrial Eras, Frank Cass.
- Marsland, D. (1987) Education and Youth, The Falmer Press.

- Midwinter, E. (1986) Fair Game: Myth and Reality in Sport, Allen and Unwin.
- Miliband, R. (1969) The State in Capitalist Society, Weidenfeld and Nicolson.
- Newman, O. (1981) Corporatism, Leisure and Collective Consumption, Centre for Leisure Studies, Salford University.
- Offe, C. (1984) Contradictions of the Welfare State, London: Hutchinson.
- Parker, S. (1976) The Sociology of Leisure, Allen and Unwin.
- Parry, N. and J. (1977) Theories of Culture and Leisure, In M.A. Smith (Ed.) Leisure and Urban Society, London: Leisure Studies Association.
- Pickvance, C. (1982) The State and Collective Consumption in State Intervention, Social Science Course D202, Block 6, Units 4 and 25, Open University.
- Pimlott, J.A.R. (1947) The Englishman's Holiday, Harvester Press.
- Plamenatz, J. (1970) Ideology, Macmillan.
- Poulantzas, N. (1978) State, Power, Socialism, London: New Left Books.
- Prescott Clarke, P. and Grimshaw, P. (1977) Sport, School and the Community, Research Working Paper, No.9, The Sports Council, London.
- Rapoport, R. and Rapoport, R.M. (1975) Leisure and the Family Life Cycle, Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Rigg, M. (1986) Action Sport: Community Sports Leadership in the Inner Cities, The Sports Council.
- Roberts, K. (1978) Contemporary Society and the Growth of Leisure, Longman Group Ltd.
- Roberts, K. (1981) Leisure, Second Edition, Longman Group Ltd.
- Roberts, K. (1983) Youth and Leisure, George Allen and Unwin.
- Rojek, C. (1985) Capitalism and Leisure Theory, Tavistock Publications.
- Rowntree, B. Seebohm (1921) The Human Factor in Business, Longmans, Green and Co., London.
- Sarup, M. (1982) Education, State and Crisis: A Marxist Perspective, Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Saunders, P. (1980) Local Government and the State, New Society, 13 March.

Schmitter, P. and Lehmbruch, G. (Eds.) (1979) Towards a Theory of Corporatist Intermediation, London: Sage.

Simon, B. (1965) Education and the Labour Movement 1870-1920, Lawrence and Wishart.

Slater, W. (1984) Sports Council: The New Approach to Grant Aid, the Ten Year Strategy and the Governing Bodies In Report of the Thirteenth National Conference of Sport and Recreation, London: Central Council of Physical Recreation.

Sloane, P.J. (1980) Sport in the Market, Hobart Paper 85, The Institute of Economic Affairs.

Streeck, W. (1983) Between Pluralism and Corporatism: German Business Associations and the State, Journal of Public Policy, 3, 265-84, August.

Talbot, M. (1979) Women and Leisure, S.S.R.C./Sports Council.

Taylor, P. (1984) Smoke Ring: The Politics of Tobacco, The Bodley Head.

Tomlinson, A. and Whannel, G. (Ed.) (1984) Five Ring Circus: Money, Power and Politics at the Olympic Games, Pluto Press.

Torkildsen, G. (1983) Leisure and Recreation Management, E. and F. N. Spon.

Touraine, A. (1974) The Post-Industrial Society, London: Wildwood House.

Veal, A.J. (1987) Leisure and the Future, Allen and Unwin.

Waite, N. (1977) Sponsorship in the U.K., Marketing Communications Research Centre.

Walvin, J. (1978) Leisure and Society 1830-1950, Longman.

Walvin, J. (1986) Football and the Decline of Britain, Macmillan.

Whannel, G. (1983) Blowing the Whistle: The Politics of Sport, Pluto Press.

Whitson, D. (1984) Leisure and the State: Theorising Struggles over Everyday Life, Leisure Studies Association, July.

Williams, R. (1961) The Long Revolution, Chatto and Windus.

Williams, R. (1983) Towards 2000, Penguin Books.

Willis, M (1977) Recreation and Deprivation in Inner Urban Areas, H.M.S.O. London.

Willis, P. (1983) Youth Unemployment: Thinking the Unthinkable, August, unpublished.

Willis, P. (1985) The Social Condition of Young People in Wolverhampton in 1984, Wolverhampton Borough Council.

Wilson, E. (1977) Women and the Welfare State, Tavistock Publications.

Wilson, Sir H. (1971) The Labour Government 1964-79: A Personal Record, London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson/Michael Joseph.

Wright, Mills, C. (1959) The Sociological Imagination, Oxford University Press.

2. OFFICIAL PUBLICATIONS

(a) H.M.S.O.

Albemarle Committee's Report (1960) The Youth Service in England and Wales.

Board of Education (1933) Syllabus of Physical Training for Schools, London.

Board of Education (1937) Physical Training and Recreation, Cmd. 5364.

Board of Education, Physical Training Series No.15 (1937) Recreation and Physical Fitness for Youths and Men, London.

Board of Education (1940) Youth, Physical Recreation and Service, Circular 1529, 8 November.

Board of Education (1941) Youth Service Corps, Circular 1543, 12 March.

Board of Education (1943) The Youth Service After the War - A Report of the Youth Advisory Council.

Department of Education and Science (1968) Report of the Committee on Football, London.

Department of Education and Science (1970) The Chance to Share, Circular 2/70, 2 February.

Department of the Environment (1972) Provision for Sport, The Sports Council, London.

Department of the Environment (1975) Sport and Recreation, London: Cmd. 6200.

Department of the Environment et al. (1977) Leisure and the Quality of Life, London.

Department of the Environment (1977) Recreation and Deprivation in Inner Urban Areas, London.

Department of the Environment (1978) Policy for Inner Cities, Cmd. 6845.

Department of the Environment (1984) Recreation Management Training Committee - Final Report, London.

Fitness Council (1983) Report of the Grants Committee to the President of the Board of Education.

Government Social Survey 338 (1969) Planning for Leisure.

Home Office (1981) The Scarman Report: The Brixton Disorders, 10-12, April 1981.

Parliamentary Debates, Hansard, House of Commons:

28 October, 1954
28 April, 1961.
8 May, 1962.
17 July, 1963.
4 December, 1964.
22 June, 1964
3 February, 1965.
19 January, 1968.
5 May, 1970.
15 February, 1971.
6 April, 1977.
9 July, 1984.

Parliamentary Debates, Hansard, House of Lords:

2 March, 1960.
15 February, 1961.
9 May, 1962.
6 November, 1962.
20 December, 1962.
31 January, 1963.
22 May, 1963.
13 May, 1964.
9 July, 1964.
3 February, 1965.
3 December, 1965.
7 February, 1968.

Select Committee of the House of Lords (1973) Sport and Leisure - Second Report, London.

(b) Other

Birmingham University (1956) Britain in the World of Sport, Physical Education Association.

Central Council of Recreative Physical Training, News Leaflets, Nos. 1-3, 1935-1937.

Central Council of Physical Recreation (1977) Sport and Young People, London.

Central Council of Physical Recreation (1984) Report of the Howell Committee of Enquiry into Sports Sponsorship, C.C.P.R.

Centre for International Sports Studies/Central Bureau for Educational Visits and Exchanges (1979) Philip Noel-Baker on Sport.

Conference of Socialist Economists (1979) In and Against the State, London Edinburgh Weekend Return Group.

Coopers and Lybrand Associates Ltd (1981) Sharing Does Work, London: The Sports Council, Study 21.

Council of Europe (1976) European Sport for All Charter, Reproduced by The Sports Council, London.

The History of Loughborough College, 1915-1952 (1957) Past Student's Association.

Liberal Publication Department (1934) Liberal Policy: The Liberal Party's Address to the Nation.

Royal Charter of the Sports Council (1971) 22 December

The Sports Council - A Review 1966-1969.

Sports Council (1968) Planning for Sport, The Central Council of Physical Recreation.

Sports Council Annual Reports: 1972-73 to 1986-87.

Sports Council (1973) Provision for Sport, Vol.II, The Sports Council.

Sports Council/Social Science Research Council (1978) Public Disorder and Sporting Events, London.

Sports Council (1982) Sport in the Community - The Next Ten Years, London: The Sports Council.

Sports Council, West Midlands Region, Action Sport Annual Reports 1983-83 and 1983-84.

United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (1978) International Charter of Physical Education and Sport.

West Midlands County Council (1978) Structure Plans for the areas of the former County Boroughs of:

Birmingham
Coventry
Dudley
Warley
West Bromwich
Walsall
Wolverhampton

Wolfenden Committee (1960) Sport and the Community, The Central Council of Physical Recreation.

3. JOURNALS AND NEWSPAPERS

(a) Journals

British Journal of Physical Education.

Bulletin of Physical Education.

Director.

European Journal of Sociology.

Journal of Public Policy.

Leisure Management.

Leisure Studies.

Leisure Studies Association Newsletter.

Marketing.

Marxism. Today.

N.A.T.F.H.E. Journal.

New Left Review.

New Society.

New Statesman.

Past and Present.

School Sport.

Sociology.

Social Science Information.

Sport and Leisure.

Sports Industry.

Sport and Recreation.

Theory, Culture and Society.

Worker Sportsman.

(b) Newspapers

The Birmingham Post.

The Daily Mail.

The Evening Standard.

The Guardian.

The Independent.

The News Chronicle.

The Observer.

The Sunday Telegraph.

The Sunday Times.

The Telegraph.

The Times.

The Times Educational Supplement.

The Times Higher Educational Supplement.

The Yorkshire Post.